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This is a set of philological notes on the text of [Euripides’s] *Rhesus*. They are intended as a companion to my forthcoming commentary on the play (Oxford University Press, 2012). They are concerned mainly with textual problems; they discuss manuscript variants and offer, where possible, new emendations. They also include some metrical discussions.
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The following notes are complementary to my forthcoming commentary on *Rhesus* (Oxford University Press, 2012), to which they are meant to serve as a companion. They are concerned mainly with textual problems, offering discussions thereof and, occasionally, new emendations. To an extent, they also aim to correct recent misconceptions of textual and metrical matters.

Text and apparatus (the latter sometimes slightly modified) are reproduced from James Diggle’s excellent OCT.

---

1 I am deeply grateful to Professors James Diggle and David Kovacs, and to three anonymous referees for *Exemplaria Classica*, all of whom offered suggestions that improved the paper on a number of points. Naturally, none of these scholars can be held responsible for the use I have made of their advice, or for any errors of fact or judgement contained in this paper.

1. Rh., Hypothesis (a) 4-6

Δόλωνα δὲ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν ὑπακούσαντα ἐκπέμπεσθαι τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφορίσεν αὐτῷ ἀφώρισεν Ao 5-6 ἐξέπεμψε θηρὸς τρόπον εἰς τὴν π-<μισθὸν> ἀφορίσας αὐτῷ e.g. Diggle

'Dolon, who responded to (Hector’s) request, was sent off ... while a space in the encampment was set apart for him (=Rhesus?)'

Diggle’s *exempli gratia* suggestion is brilliant: ‘(Hector) sent (Dolon) off to the (enemy) encampment disguised as a beast, having set a reward for him.’ It has, however, the drawback of making Dolon’s disguise part of Hector’s orders, when it is in fact Dolon’s own idea (cf. *Rh.* 201-15). More importantly, it says nothing about Rhesus’ subsequent arrival, an important and spectacular scene.

I propose (again *exempli gratia*, inevitably): ἐκπέμψας <῾Ρῆσον μετ’ ὀλίγον ἀφικόμενον ἀπέδέξατο> τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφορίσας αὐτῷ, ‘after he had sent off (Dolon), Hector admitted to his presence Rhesus, who arrived shortly afterwards, and demarcated a space in the (Trojan) encampment especially for him (i.e. Rhesus);’ cf. *Rh.* 518-20, where Hector promises to show Rhesus a ‘space away from the marshalled troops’; the detail is important for the plot, since Rhesus’ cut-off bivouac will facilitate his murder. The resulting hiatus (ὑπακούσαντα ἐκπέμψας) can be easily avoided by reading Δόλωνα δὲ ὑπακούσαντα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν. For ἀποδέχομαι = ‘admit to one’s presence’ cf. Polyb. 21.35.5. My supplement glosses over Hector’s initial reluctance to accept Rhesus as a belated ally (319-32), but the omission would be acceptable in a summary.

2. Rh., Hypothesis (a) 15-18

παραγενηθέντος δὲ Ἕκτορος ἵνα αὐτόπτης τῶν πεπραγμένων γένηται τετρωμένος ο τῶν Ῥήσου πόλων ἐπιμελητὴς διὰ τοῦ Ἕκτορος τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσθαι ἐπι-νοεῖ pap: δι’ αὐτοῦ φησὶν (φησὶν Ao : φασὶν Q : om. spat. uac. relicito V) Ἕκτορος τὸν φόνον γεγενῆσθαι Ω

'When Hector came along to see for himself what had happened, the wounded keeper of Rhesus' horses claimed (?) that the murder was committed by the agency of Hector.'

In 17-18, ἐπινοεῖ is the reading of PSI XII 1286 col. i 17; but 'contrives' or 'devises' is hardly appropriate as a description of the charioteer's accusations (Rhee 835-55). Moreover, not only is the hiatus ἐνηργῆσαι ἐπινοεῖ inadmissible, the tense is also undesirable, since this author seems to avoid the historic present. The medieval mss give 'he says that the murder was committed through the agency of Hector himself' — an inferior version altogether, cf. especially the banalizing γεγενῆσαι as opposed to the choicer ἐνηργῆσαι. At any rate, in both versions, διὰ τοῦ Ἐκτορὸς (pap.) or δι’ αὐτοῦ ... Ἐκτορὸς (mss.) are factually inaccurate: the charioteer does not accuse Hector of actually being the agent of Rhesus' murder, but only of having masterminded it. Relics of the original uox propria may be preserved in ἐπινοεῖ: e.g. {διὰ τοῦ} Ἐκτορὸς <ἐπινοήσαντος> τὸν φόνον <φησίν> ἐνηργῆσαι, note that φησί seems to be the only verb this author allows, for reasons unclear, to appear in the historic present; cf. Hyp. (a) 21-2 Diggle οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλέα φησίν ἀδάκρυτον ἔσεσαι. Still, one may attempt to emend such presents away; here, one might envisage, for instance, {διὰ τοῦ} Ἐκτορὸς<ἐπινοήσαντος ἐφησε> τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσαι.

3. Rh. 16-19

[Χο. θάρσει. Ἐκ. θαρσῶ.
†μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; Χο. οὐκ ἔστι. Ἐκ. τί σὺ γὰρ†
φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖς στρατιῶν,]
eἰ μὴ τιν’ ἐχων νυκτηριών;
16-18 del. Diggle (post 15 fort. lac. indicanda est propter hiatum) 1 7
οὐκ ἔστιν. Ἐκ. τί LQ: οὐκέτι ΟV 17 (ante τί) "Ἐκ. Ο: paragr. Λ: om. ΒQ [Χο. οὐκ ἔστιν. Ἐκ.] τί Dindorf, Χο. οὐκ ἔσθ', <Ἐκτορός. Ἐκ. τί Jackson

---


5 See W. S. Barrett, CQ 15, 1965, 61 n. 2 = Barrett, Papers (supra, n. 4) 441 n. 3.

6 For the clausula — Ο — — — — in Hypotheses see J. Diggle, “Rhythmic prose” (supra, n. 3) 37 (no. 5).

7 For the clausula — Ο — — — — (the commonest Ciceronian clausula, cretic + spondee) see J. Diggle, “Rhythmic prose” (supra, n. 3) 29-30 (no. 1). For ἐφη as (apposed to ἐφι) as this author’s favourite form cf. W. Luppe, Anagenesis 3, 1983, 198; idem, Philologus 127, 1983, 136; both cited by J. Diggle, “Rhythmic prose” (supra, n. 3) 55 n. 60.
‘(Chorus) Have courage! —(Hector) I do have courage! Has there been a night ambush? —(Ch.) No. —(He.) Why then have you abandoned your watch-post and are stirring up the army unless you have some night-report to make?’

Division of an anapaestic metron between two speakers (θάρσει—θαρσῶ) occurs again at 17 and, perhaps, at 561, but is otherwise paralleled only twice in tragedy: S. Tr. 977, 991, and [E.] IA 2-3 στειχε—στείχω ... στείδε—στείδω. The IA, which is especially akin to our passage, is interpolated. Diggle excises lines 16-18, but as he is aware this leaves us with an unlikely hiatus between θορύβῳ in 15 and εἰ in 19. Although 18 reappears almost verbatim as 37b-38a, it is surely (pace Diggle) the latter passage that is interpolated: 18 makes perfect sense in a context in which Hector berates the guards for abandoning their posts (cf. 20-2); less so in 37-8 where Hector is merely trying to make sense of the chorus’ utterances. What is more, θάρσει in 16 is indispensable in view of τὰ δὲ θαρσύνεις in 35.

An undeservedly forgotten solution is Badham’s Χο. θάρσει. Ἑκ. {θαρσῶ·} μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; | Χο. οὔτες. Ἑκ. τί σοῦ γάρ κτλ.13, which also eliminates the anomalous lack of diaeresis between metra in 17 (λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν)14. There are less invasive remedies available: delete OV’s οὐκέτι15 or LQ’s οὐκ ἔστι16. However, such deletions, as well as producing a caesura-less anapaestic metron, make τί σοῦ γάρ in 17 —surely a retort to something the chorus has said— seem incoherent. More promising is Jackson’s οὐκ ἔσθ’, Ἔκτορ17, which was more recently backed up by Taplin18. However this may be, the fact remains that the division of speakers within the anapaestic metron seems to be an irreducible anomaly, despite Ritchie, Authenticity (supra, n.8) 290-1. Perhaps it ought to be attributed to conscious imitation of

15 G. Dindorf (ed.), Euripidis tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta, Oxford 1840, 3, on Rh. 18.
17 See J. Jackson, Marginalia Scaenica, Oxford 1955, 12.
18 See O. Taplin, PCPhS n.s. 23, 1977, 126.
the *Trachiniae* passage mentioned above (the author of *Rhesus* is generally prone to such quirks of style).

In line 19, Kovacs suggested εἰ μή τιν’ ἐρεῖς νυκτηγρεσίαν (‘unless you have some nocturnal activity to report’) for the transmitted εἰ μή τιν’ ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν. This is ingenious: νυκτηγρεσία / νυκτεγερσία (‘waking by night’) is elsewhere used with reference to the Doloneia’s nocturnal action; cf. Accius, *Nyctegresia*, frr. 127-37 Dangel; *P.Oxy.* 2176 frr. 3-5, line 6 (Addendum on p. 184); Strab. 9.5.18 (439C., III.142 Radt). But there seems to be no good reason to reject νυκτηγορίαν in the first place. It is retained, for instance, in Nauck’s τί σο γὰρ φιλακάς προλιπῶν κινεῖς | στρατιάν; τίν’ ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν;²⁰.

4. Rh. 53-5

ἀνδρεὶς γὰρ ἐκ γῆς τῆς νυκτέρου πλάτη
λαθῶντες ὀμμα τούμον ἀρεῖσθαι φυγὴν
μέλλουσι

53 ἀνδρεὺς Elmsley : ἀ- Ω : α- pap. 54 ἀρεῖσθαι Nauck : αἰρεῖσθαι pap. :
αἴρεσθαι Ω φυγὴν Stephanus : φυγή(ι) OLQ : φυγη[ V (ras.): φυγη[ pap.

‘For these people are about to flee this land by nocturnal ship-voyage without being observed by me.’

Nauck’s emendation of the ms. αἰρεῖσθαι has received some support from ΑΙΡΕΙΣΘΑΙ in *P.Achm.* 4²¹. The future stem may express, with μέλλει, an imminent futurity; however, a notion of urgent imminence can also be conveyed by μέλλω + present stem, the continuative aspect laying emphasis on the action’s duration; cf. 110 στρατὸν μέλλεις ἄγειν²².

There is a further reason why αἴρεσθαι ought to be kept. As pointed out by Barrett²³, Stephanus’ φυγήν (also in 126, where the mss. again have φυγη)²⁴ would be more apposite if the activity undertaken were burdensome

---

¹⁹ Euripidea Tertia (supra, n. 11) 147.


²³ Barrett, *Papers* (supra, n. 4) 258 n. 69.

²⁴ For the idiom see also A. Pers. 481 αἰροῦνται φυγήν (Elmsley : αἱροῦνται φ- mss.). It is perhaps an extended usage from such phrases as ἵστια αἰρεῖσθαι ‘to hoist sail’; or, in the active, E. Hec. 1141 ἀρεῖαν στόλον, *IT* 117 νόστον ἄρομεν πάλιν, Th. 1.52 τὰς ναὸς ἄραντες; cf.
or troublesome; however, the requisite meaning here should be no more than ‘take to flight’, since ‘Hektor is concerned with rumoured evacuation solely from his own point of view and not the Greeks’. Thus, the transmitted reading is to be preferred: ‘αἴρεσθαι φυγῇ is a perfectly proper “put to sea in flight” that calls for no change’; in this case, the transmitted αἴρεσθαι (passive) is paralleled by A. Su. 2, Hdt. 1.165.3, 170.2. For the dative cf. E. Med. 938 ἀπαροῦμεν (Elmsley: ἀπαίρομεν mss.) φυγῇ.

5. Rh. 59-62

εἰ γὰρ φαεννοὶ μὴ †ξυνέσχον† ἡλίου
λαμπτῆρες, οὔτὰν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δόρυ,
πρὶν ναῦς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκηνῶν μολεῖν
κτείνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῇδε πολυφόνῳ χερί.

‘For if the sun’s gleaming lamp had not been extinguished, I would by no means have stayed my successful spear before setting fire to the ships and going through the tents killing Achaeans with this hand of mine, slayer of many.’

In line 59, ξυνέσχον has so far resisted emendation. The ms. reading should require με to be mentally supplied as object, but the resulting sense (‘had the gleaming sun not restrained me’) would be odd. C. E. Palmer’s translation ‘had not the bright rays of the sun withdrawn themselves’ is impossible. What is more, ΞΥΝΕΣΧΟΝ seems to be an error by anticipation of ΟΥΤΑΝΕΣΧΟΝ in the following line; it must have ousted a word meaning something like ‘be put out’ or ‘be extinguished’. Heimsoeth’s ξανεῖσαν, accepted by Kovacs in his Loeb edition (supra, n. 16), goes some way towards restoring sense, but the sun cannot properly be said to have ‘let go of’ Hector. Van Herwerden’s (μὴ) ‘φθόνησαν is elegant, but fails to account for the initial ξυν-. Wecklein’s ξέλειπον neatly conveys the idea of the sun’s ‘failing’ Hector (ἐκλείπω is also the uox propria for the sun’s eclipse), and is accepted by Jouan with good reason; for the durative verbal aspect used of a specific occurrence in the past cf. Il. 2.106-7 (alternation of ἔλιπεν and λεῖπε in the same context). For a list

Mastronarde on E. Med. 938.

Both quotations from Barrett, l.c. (n. 23).

Cf. Pace, “Note” (supra, n. 22) 454-5.

CR 4, 1890, 228.


of emendations and further discussion see E. Magnelli, "Miscellanea critica", *Eikasmos* 10, 1999, 101-17, here 101-4. His own proposal εἰ γὰρ φαεννοὺς μὴ ξυνέσχεν ἥλιος | λαμπτῆρας κτλ., ‘for if the sun had not held back his gleaming lamps’, makes for unlikely Greek, even though the light emitted by celestial bodies is, indeed, often compared to long-range missiles, such as lances and arrows, which one can ‘hold back’ (Magnelli, "Miscellanea critica", 102-3). No such comparison is in evidence in the present passage, however, and even if it were I doubt that συνέχειν would be the ουξ propria to signify ‘refrain from shooting a weapon’ (Magnelli fails to adduce any evidence whatsoever). The *crux* seems intractable, despite Wecklein’s brilliant emendation.


καίτων περάσας κοῖλον αὐλώνων βάθος,
εἰ μὴ κυρήσεις πολεμίους ὀπὸ χθονὸς
φεύγοντας ἄλλα σῶν βλέποντας ἐς δόρυ,
νικώμενοι μὲν οὔτι μὴ μόλης πόλιν.

115

115 οὔτι μὴ Cobet: τήνδ’ οὐ μὴ VaQ et cod. L a Triclinio tertia emendatio: τήνδ’ ἐμὴ O: τήνδε μὴ οὐ Schaefer (seruato πόλιν)π ἀ λ ι ν Reiske: πόλιν Ω

‘Yet should you find, once you have crossed the deep and hollow moat, that the enemies are not fleeing this land but are facing your army instead, there is no way you will come back if you are defeated.’

The mss readings are either unmetrical (τήνδ’ οὐ μὴ μόλης πόλιν) or ungrammatical (τήνδε μὴ μόλης πόλιν). Cobet suggested οὔτι μὴ, Reiske μόλης πάλιν. Of interest is Schaefer’s τήνδε μὴ οὐ μόλης πόλιν, with μὴ οὐ in synecphonesis, producing an independent clause expressing fear that something may not prove true. Although Troy cannot be visible in the darkness, τήνδε πόλιν, ‘this city here’, would be acceptable, since ὅδε can refer with some vividness to absent persons or things that have just been spoken of, and are thus present to the speaker’s mind; cf. 655 τῇδε … πόλει. However, there seems to be little point in Aeneas’ foregrounding the city

---

of Troy as Hector’s potential place of refuge rather than bringing up the distinct possibility that he may never come back into the Trojan camp at all — an idea neatly conveyed by Reiske’s πάλιν.

7. Rh. 131

τάδε δόκει, τάδε μεταθέμενος νόει
δόκει Dawe μεταθέμενος Ην, coni. Musgrave: μετατιθέμενος Ω

‘This is what we think (too), this opinion you must adopt, changing your mind’

Found only in Hauniensis 417 (an apograph of Pal. Gr. 98), μεταθέμενος restores responson with this line’s antistrophic pair (195). As is her wont, Pace36 tries to defend the majority reading μετατιθέμενος, assuming Responsionsfreiheit, i.e. ΩΟΩ — ΩΩΩΩΩΩ — Ω in 131, corresponding to 2 dochmiacs in 195. However, the whole idea of Responsionsfreiheit is highly dubious, because it relies largely on textually suspect passages37, or is otherwise limited to very specific metrical variants38. But apart from the dubiety of such an assumption, the parallels adduced by Pace for resolved second anceps followed by resolved longum in dochmiacs can be easily emended, as she is aware; even the scheme ΩΩΩ — — ΩΩ is exceedingly rare39.

As for Dawe’s δόκει, it is presumably meant to balance νόει. It is, however, unnecessary. δοκεῖ presents the chorus’ opinion as a fait accompli which Hector is expected to take seriously under consideration — as indeed he does (cf. 137).

8. Rh. 149-50

τίς δῆτα Τρώων οἳ πάρεισιν ἐν λόγῳ
θέλει κατόπτης ναῦς ἐπ’ Ἀργείων μολεῖν;
149 λόγω(ι) OVAQ : λόγω Λ et Q(s.l., a.c.)

‘Well then, which one of the Trojans here present wants to go to the Argives’ ships as a spy?’

39 Cf. N. C. Conomis, “The Dohmiacs of Greek Drama”, Hermes 92, 1964, 23-50, here 28, 36. The inappropriateness of Responsionsfreiheit here is seen even by S. Delle Donne (“In margine ad una edizione “colometrica” dei cantica del Reso di Euripide”, Rudiae 16-17, 2004/5, 171-208, here 202-3), who had nonetheless earlier in the same article (p. 177) pronounced such Responsionsfreiheit ’più che plausibile’.
The variant ἐν λόχῳ is found in L and Q (the latter supra lineam ante correctionem); moreover, as pointed out by Morstadt⁴⁰, ἐν λόχῳ must have been in the model of Chr. Pat. 1933 τίς δὴ παρέισιν ἐνθάδε; — otherwise, there would have been no reason to change ἐν λόγῳ, which (unlike ἐν λόχῳ) suits the Chr. Pat. context.

Should one prefer ἐν λόχῳ over ἐν λόγῳ then? The answer is probably no. While it is true that tragic choruses are sometimes referred to, figuratively, as λόχος (e.g. A. Sept. 111, Eum. 46, 1026), the addressees of Hector’s proclamation are not the chorus, who cannot be expected to spy upon the Greeks while on guard duty, but the Trojan warriors already present on stage (2-4; cf. 154ff.). For οἳ πάρεισιν ἐν λόγῳ = ‘those present at this announcement’, i.e. ‘all of the present company’⁴¹, cf. Ar. Av. 30, Ach. 513 (with Dunbar, Olson ad ll.). In Il. 10.299-312 Hector makes a similar proclamation, likewise prefacing his speech with a question addressed to all those present: τίς κέν μοι τόδε ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσει | δῶρῳ ἐπι μεγάλω; (303-4)⁴².

9. Rh. 165

τὰξαὶ δὲ μισθῶν, πλὴν ἐμῆς τυραννίδος ἐμὴν τυραννίδα Nauck, cl. 173

‘So, name your reward [= ask for any reward you like], except for my kingship.’

Nauck’s πλὴν ἐμὴν τυραννίδα⁴³ brings the syntax into line with 173 πλὴν στρατηλάτας νεῶν, where the accusative is in accord with the implied object of αἴτει. But while the accusative in 173 serves to avoid the repetition of two successive genitives (πλὴν στρατηλατῶν νεῶν), there is no reason to tamper with the normal construction of prepositional πλὴν + genitive here. Nauck’s emendation probably does not even deserve a place in the apparatus.

10. Rh. 166

οὐ σῆς ἐρῶμεν πολιόχου τυραννίδος πολιόχου OQ: πολιούχου V: πολυόχου L

‘We have no desire for your city-guarding kingship’

---

⁴⁰ R. Morstadt, Beitrag zur Kritik der dem Euripides zugeschriebenen Tragödie Rhesos, Heidelberg 1827, 8 n. 1.
⁴¹ Not ‘those who are within hearing of my words’, despite Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 115.
⁴² For a defence of ἐν λόγῳ see also A. Meschini, in Scritti in onore di †Carlo Diano, Bologna 1975, 217-26, here 217.
⁴³ Nauck, “Studien” (supra, n. 20) 170.
L’s πολυόχου is doubtless a iotaist error; cf. 381 πολύφρον (OV) < πολύ-
(LQ). It may have been understood as meaning ‘ruling over many’ (πολύς + ἕχω). Such a meaning, however, would be an impossibility. In classical Greek, dependent determinative compounds with πολύ- as first component and a verbal second component are always resolvable into ὁ ἔχων πολλ- + a noun corresponding to the verbal component, e.g. πολυμέριμνος = ὁ πολλὰς μερίμνας ἔχων. This is impossible with πολυόχος.

11. Rh. 169

χρυσὸς πάρεστιν, εἰ τόδ’ αἰτήσεις γέρας
πάρεστιν OV : γάρ ἑστιν LQ αἰτήση V

‘There is gold, if this is the prize you mean to ask for’

For V’s predilection for middle verbal forms cf. 175 (ἐξαιτεῖς: -τή V), and 181 (αἰτήσεις LQ and Chr. Pat. 1972 : -σὴ O; -σει V). There would have been little point in arguing for the active or the middle, since they are practically equivalent here, were it not for two unambiguous cases where the active is used (αἴτει 173, ἀπαιτῶ 174). For pairs of active-middle verbal forms with no discernible semantic distinction see R. J. Allan, The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek, Amsterdam 2003, 206-10.

12. Rh. 204

ἐπεὶ τίν’ ἄλλην ἀντὶ τῆσδ’ ἕξεις στολήν;
ἐπεὶ τίν’ OV et Qc : ἐπεὶ τὴν τίν’ Q : εἰπ’ ἦ τίν’ L

‘Why, what new gear will you change into?’

L’s reading deserves some attention: ‘say, will you then change into some new gear?’ For the combination of imperative (εἰπέ) and direct question cf. 207 λέγον, τίς ἐστάι...; However, interrogative ἦ usually introduces questions, and is not preceded by another word, except a vocative or ἄλλα (see LSJ s.v. ἦ, II.1) — certainly not by an imperative, which might itself introduce an indirect εἰ-question. Thus, on the basis of the L reading, Pierson proposed εἰπ’ εἰ τίν’ ἄλλην ἀντὶ τῆσδε κτλ, ‘tell me whether you will change into some new gear instead of this one’45. This, however, is exceedingly feeble: the

chorus have already been told that Dolon will change into a different attire (202); what they need to know is what kind of attire (τίν’ . . . στολήν) this is going to be. Moreover, Pierson’s text would probably require an affirmative γε in Dolon’s reply (πρέπουσαν <γ’>), but there is no room for such an addition. Pierson adduces E. Herc. 1118 as a parallel (εἴπ’ εἴ τι καλόν ύπογράφῃ τώμῳ βίο); but the situation there is quite different: a baffled Herakles is gradually becoming aware of the enormity of his acts, and his question to Theseus (‘tell me whether you are revealing my life in a strange new light’, cf. Bond ad l.) reflects his complete ignorance of the facts. More to the point is Herwerden’s εἰφ’ ήντιν’ ἀλλήν κτλ., ‘tell us what other gear you will put on’. But both Herwerden’s and Pierson’s emendations introduce an exceedingly harsh asyndeton which would be hard to justify in this context. It should not go without saying that ἐπεί is perfectly good and idiomatic.

13. Rh. 206

σοφοῦ παρ’ ἄνδρός χρή σοφόν τι μανθάνειν

‘One must learn cleverness from clever men’

A 12th-century gnomologium, Athous Vatopedii 36, has σοφοῦ πρὸς ἄνδρός, a perfectly plausible alternative, cf. e.g. S. OC 12-13 μανθάνειν ... πρὸς ἀστῶν. True, the rest of the tradition (in its gnomological ramifications too: Orion Flor. 1.7 p. 78 Haffner, Men. Mon. 718 Pernigotti), and Chr. Pat. 1766 unanimously provide παρ’ ἄν-, but πρὸς ἄν- is surely lectio difficilior.

14. Rh. 208

λύκειον ἀμφὶ νῶτ’ ἐνάψομαι δοράν
νῶτ’ ἐνάψομαι Cobet: νῶτον ἐνάψομαι OV : νῶτα θήσομαι LQ

‘On my back I shall fasten a wolf’s hide.’

Cobet’s emendation has been generally accepted, and with good reason (although not by the hyper-conservative Zanetto, who prints the OV

tragoediae (supra, n. 15), adll.


48 See C.G. Cobet, Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores graecos, Leiden 1873, 583.
reading). Cobet was surely right: it is ἐνάπτεσθαι (middle rather than passive, despite LSJ’s s.v.) that is commonly used to signify ‘fit’ to one’s body, ‘wear’; cf. Hdt. 7.69.1 λεοντέας ἐναμμένοι; E. Herc. 549 τάδ’ ἢδη περιβόλαι’ ἐνήμεθα; Ar. Nu. 72 διθέραν ἐνημένον, Ec. 80, Av. 1250, Ra. 430; fr. 264 KA ὁ χορὸς … ἐναψάμενος δάπιδες. I see no difficulty in the fact that Cobet’s text gives an elision after the third princeps, which otherwise occurs in Rh. only in 986. Such lines are far from unparalleled in tragedy.

15. Rh. 219-20

σωθήσομαι τοι καὶ κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέως
οἴσω κάρα σοι

219 τοι Diggle: τε VLQ et ΣV: δέ O: χε Wilamowitz

‘I shall return safe, I’m telling you, and having killed Odysseus I shall bring you his head’

As Diggle has shown, neither τε nor δέ can stand: τε would be exceedingly feeble as a correlative with καί, while δέ would be inappropriate either as adversative or as continued. Diggle’s τοι gives highly idiomatic style, for it is regularly used in answer to a command or wish, and the corruption of τοι to τε is especially easy when καί follows. There are, however, alternates worth considering, e.g. Wilamowitz’s χε, in its common usage as response-intensifier: it is a neat and elegant emendation, the more so since it nicely accounts, palaeographically, for τε: ‘yes, I shall return safely’ is an apposite reply to the chorus-leader’s ‘all you need now is luck’. I should also suggest δή as another possibility: often corrupted into δέ (O), δή is often used by the tragedians to emphasize verbs, sometimes with emotional force; thus, σωθήσομαι δή = ‘I shall, indeed, return safely.’

16. Rh. 227-30

ίκοι ἐννύχιος
καὶ γενοῦ ὁστήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς
ἀγμόν καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις

230

50 See E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, München 1950, 2, 231.
51 See Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 285-6.
52 See Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n.4), 473 with n. 151.
53 Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 513-15.
55 Quotation from Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 513.
56 Cf. Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 130-1.
57 Cf. Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 214-16.
‘(O Apollo,) do appear in the night, and be a safe guide on this man’s mission, and aid Dardanus’ descendants’.

W. Dindorf’s\textsuperscript{58} transposition of the mss word-order (ἵκοῦ ἐννύχιος | ἁγεμὼν σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς | καὶ γενοῦ καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις) has won almost universal approval. Zanetto (cf. \textit{supra}, n. 49) predictably keeps the paradosis, but emends καὶ γενοῦ into καὶ πόνου (governed, together with πομπᾶς, by ἁγεμὼν). However, ἁγεμὼν πόνου is odd: we should expect e.g. ξυλλήπτωρ, as in \textit{E. Med.} 946, oddly invoked elsewhere by Zanetto in support of his emendation\textsuperscript{59}. Moreover, it would be pointless to have a feebly vague πόνου supplement an appositely specific πομπᾶς. The attempt by several scholars\textsuperscript{60} to defend the paradosis as an instance of the σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, i.e. γενοῦ καὶ ξύλλαβε = ξυγγενοῦ καὶ ξύλλ- will carry little conviction.

17. \textit{Rh.} 231-2

\begin{quote}

ὦ παγκρατές, ὦ Τροῖς
tείχη παλαιώ δείμας

Τροῖς Lachmann: τροῖς Ω

‘O, all-mighty one, you who built Troy’s ancient walls.’
\end{quote}

For Τροῖς, which is metrically necessary, see K. Lachmann, \textit{De chorici systematis tragicorum graecorum libri quattuor}, Berlin 1819, 154 n. For the form cf. also \textit{Rh.} 262 (emend. Dindorf), 360 (emend. Murray) and, probably, S. \textit{Aj.} 1190 (emend. Wilamowitz). According to Aristarchus and Herodian, Homeric usage requires that trisyllabic Τροῖς be used only as epithet of πόλις (‘Trojan town’; by contrast, disyllabic Τρόιη = ‘Troy’ as substantive)\textsuperscript{61}. Whether this is Aristarchus’ own conjecture or it represents genuine tradition\textsuperscript{62}, the presumed rule is observed neither here nor in 360 (although it is followed, albeit loosely, in 262). This may well mean that

\textsuperscript{58} See Dindorf, \textit{Euripidis tragoediae} (\textit{supra}, n. 15), ad 224-263 (p. 597).


\textsuperscript{61} Cf. \textit{Il.} 1.129 with ΣΑ \textit{ad l.} (129c, 147.13ff. Erbse); \textit{Od.} 5.39, 11.510 with Σ \textit{ad ll.} (1.244.24-6, 11.517.6 Dindorf); \textit{Hdn. Il. pros.} 1.129 (\textit{Gr. Gr.} III.2.2.1, p. 23.36ff. Lentz).

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. C. G. Cobet, \textit{Miscellanea critica}, Leiden 1876, 253.
the Homeric edition known to the author of *Rhesus* made no distinction between disyllabic and trisyllabic forms; perhaps the distinction had even vanished from live performances of Homer, despite the fact that these probably did preserve elements of archaic accentuation, which influenced the Alexandrian editors’ (including Aristarchus’) decisions on matters of Homeric accentuation. If so, Aristarchus’ thesis is somewhat weakened. In 262, Dindorf’s *Tροϊαν* is an epithet, and thus conformant with Aristarchus’ standards of Homeric usage.

18. *Rh.* 245–9

\[\eta \sigma π\acute{a}νις \alpha\acute{e}i \quad 245\]

\[\tau\omicron\nu\ δ\acute{a}γ\acute{a}θων, \\omicron\tau\omicron\ δ\acute{h}υς\acute{a}λιον \\epsilon\nu \ \pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{a}γει\]

\[\kai \ \sigmaαλευ\acute{h}\]

\[\pi\omicron\acute{a}l\acute{i}\]

245 *σπάνις *αιεί Wilamowitz: *σπάνια* Ο: *σπανία* V\textsuperscript{2} et ΣV: *πανία* V: *σπάνις* LQ: *σπάνις* ἐστί Ritchie

‘Indeed, there is a dearth of good men when a sunless sky is upon the sea, and the city is tempest-tossed.’

Wilamowitz’s neat *σπάνις* *αιεί* (\(\alpha\epsilon\ι\)) was first aired *ap.* Murray’s OCT (in app. crit.)\textsuperscript{64}. The mss. readings are all one syllable shorter than the corresponding 256. It may be of some significance that *σπανία* (\(\nu\ \pi\omicron\acute{a}l\acute{i}\ \nu\ Πορς\) is reported as a synonym for *σπάνις* (\(\nu\ \pi\omicron\acute{a}l\acute{i}\ \nu\ \nu\ Πορς\), obviously an emendation) by Hesych. \(\sigma\ 1402\) Hansen, Phot. *Lex.* 529.12 Porson. Another possibility is Ritchie’s\textsuperscript{65} *σπάνις* ἐστίν, which is however feeble than Wilamowitz’s emendation. Willink’s\textsuperscript{66} conjecture, *\(\eta \ \sigmaπ\acute{a}νι\)’ \(\omega\ι\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \\omicron\acute{a}γ\acute{a}θων,* ‘rare indeed [are \(\lambda\Eta\omicron\muατ\acute{a}\)] such as [are those] of \(\omicron\iota\ \\omicron\alphaγ\acute{a}θοι’*, makes for contorted phrasing, not least because the implied change of number from singular (\(\lambda\Eta\omicron\muατ\acute{a}\)) to plural is quite jarring. Alternatively, one might consider emending 256 instead; indeed, Dindorf\textsuperscript{67} suggested reading ἔ\(\omicron\iota\ \gamma\acute{a}ς\) / \(\gamma\acute{\alpha}\) / \(\gamma\acute{\alpha}\) there\textsuperscript{68}; however, as Ritchie (\(l.c\)) points out \(\gamma\alpha\alpha\alpha\)-forms are unanimously transmitted in 256.


\(\textsuperscript{64}\) G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae*, vol. III, Oxford 1909 (corr. repr. 1913).

\(\textsuperscript{65}\) Ritchie, *Authenticity* (\(supra\) n. 8) 301.

\(\textsuperscript{66}\) Willink, “Cantica” (\(supra\), n. 9) 29 = *Collected Papers* 568.

\(\textsuperscript{67}\) *Euripidis tragoeidiae*, \(supra\), n. 15 ad 256.

\(\textsuperscript{68}\) So also Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921, 584 n. 1.
19. *Rh.* 253-7

τίν’ ἄνδρ’ Ἀχαιῶν ὁ πεδοστιβὴς σφαγεὺς
οὔτασει ἐν κλισίαις, τετράτουν
μίμον ἔχουν ἐπὶ γαίας
θηρός;
256 γαίας LQ: γαῖα O: γαϊαν V

‘Which of the Achaeans will the crawling slaughterer slay in their
huts, mimicking a beast’s four-footed trail on the ground?’ (lit.,
‘putting on a four-footed mimicry of a beast’).

*Pace* Diggle and Kovacs, who print ἐπὶ γαίας, one should probably prefer
either the O or the V reading; so Zanetto, Feickert, Jouan (ἐπὶ γᾶν, after
Dindorf, cf. item 18 above). With the O reading, the sense of motion would
merge with that of support (Dolon will be *crawling over* the land), cf. LSJ⁹
s.v. ἐπί, B.1.2.a, and e.g. *Il.* 4.443 ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει. With the V reading, the
sense of extension over a space would prevail (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐπί, C.1.5): Dolon
will pursue his mission *over* a large stretch of land. Murray’s ἐπιγαίαν is


νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον ἐβαλείν στρατὸν,
κλυόντα πλήρη πεδία πολεμίας χερός.
ἐβαλείν Diggle: ἐμβ- Ω: cf. Chr. Pat. 2096, 2452 μορφῇ γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον
eἰσβαλεῖν τινα (εἰσβαλεῖν ἔφην 2452)

‘You see, it is no slight matter to come upon an army at night,
having heard the flatslands full of enemy soldiers.’

With Diggle’s ἐβαλείν⁶⁹, the implied subject of the infinitive must be τινὰ;
as for στρατὸν, it will be an accusative after a verb of motion, for which
Diggle invokes as a parallel E. *Cyc.* 99 Βρομίου πόλιν ἔστημεν ἐβαλεῖν.
Consequently, γὰρ in 285 will explain not why Rhesus chose the rugged glades
of Mt Ida over the level and broad roads (which is what Hector has asked in
282-3), but rather why the shepherd has no information on the Thracian’s
reasons for doing so (284 οὐκ οἶδ’ ἀκριβῶς); he became frightened by the
great din produced by Rhesus’ advancing army (287, 290-1, 308), thought
that the approaching troops were Greeks (294-5, hence πολεμίας χερός in
286), and ran away to protect Hector’s flocks from the enemy (291-5).

⁶⁹ See Diggle, *Euripidea* (supra, n. 4) 515.
Diggle’s conjecture stumbles upon three difficulties:

(i) If the γάρ-clause explains οὐκ οἶδ’ ἀκριβῶς rather than εἰκάσασι γε μὴν πάρα (284), the antithesis introduced by the latter is oddly interrupted, since we never learn exactly what the shepherd’s ‘conjecture’ (εἰκάσασι) consisted of.

(ii) Moreover, with Diggle’s conjecture, the γάρ-clause will not really explain the shepherd’s lack of information: even if he had remained in his usual position, he would still be no better informed as to the reasons for Rhesus’ choice of route; after all, he did eventually have the opportunity to converse with the Thracian advance scouts (296-7) but is apparently none the wiser for it. By contrast, with the lectio tradita ἐμβαλεῖν the rationale behind the shepherd’s conjecture becomes transparent: the oddly inconvenient route taken by Rhesus was, presumably (εἰκάσασι), due to his wish to avoid leading his army upon (ἐμβαλεῖν) the enemy soldiers with which the Trojan plain was infested (286).

(iii) Most importantly perhaps, intransitive εἰσβάλλω is normally followed by an accusative denoting the place or area entered — as, indeed, it does in all the passages cited by Diggle in support of his emendation70: E. Hipp. 1198, Cyc. 99, Andr. 968, Ba. 1045, Phaeth. fr. 779.1 K. But στρατόν cannot really fulfil this function.

When all is said and done, I would rather keep the lectio tradita ἐμβαλεῖν, with στρατόν as object: ‘it is no slight matter to bring in an army’; cf. A. Sept. 583, 1019 (where 1019, probably an interpolation, seems merely a rehash of 583). It is true that transitive εἰσβάλλω with στρατιάν uel sim. as its object is an established usage (LSJ s.v. εἰσβάλλω I, II); and both ἐμβάλλω and εἰσβάλλω are used alternatively in Hdt. 4.125.4, and appear as mss. variants in Hdt. 5.15.2 and 9.13.2. But this is all the more reason not to depart from the lectio tradita.

Diggle’s objections71 to the lectio tradita do not carry much conviction. Firstly, it is simply not true that ‘Rhesus, when he appears, is brim-full of insouciance, and has borne the troubles of a night-time arrival with a very light heart’. For aside from the fact that Rhesus does complain of the extreme difficulties he has had to face on his way to Troy (426-42), the shepherd cannot possibly be aware of Rhesus’ supposed ‘insouciance’, since he has never seen him. Secondly, to claim that ‘Rhesus did not hear the land full of enemy troops, for the Greeks were cooped up by their ships and had every reason to keep quiet’ (Diggle l.c.) is to disregard the advance information Rhesus turns out (quite plausibly) to have had as to the troubles the Greek army has been causing Hector for ten whole years (444-6). Finally, we have already shown —see (ii) above— that γάρ (285) explains not the shepherd’s lack of ‘precise information […] about the route which Rhesus has taken’.

70 Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 163.
71 Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 515.
but rather the rationale behind his conjecture about the possible reason why Rhesus has chosen a patently troublesome route through Mt Ida’s glades.

21. Rh. 296–7

στείχων δ’ ἄνακτος προφέρευνητάς ὁδοῦ ἀνιστόρησα Θρῆκίος προσφέρεσσαν
296 ὁδοῦ V: στρατοῦ OLQ

“So, I went and questioned the king’s advance scouts, addressing them in the Thracian tongue.’

ἄνακτος has given pause to some editors: the shepherd could not have known at the time that a king was on his way to TROY. But none of the several emendations proposed so far is wholly satisfactory72. It seems best to assume that the shepherd is merely speaking with hindsight (cf. also 290 Θρῆκιος … στρατός, 299 σύμμαχος).

As for ὁδοῦ, it is preferable to στρατοῦ both because the latter is a redundancy (the προφέρευνηταί can only be part of an army, even though they function separately from it) and because of the syntactical awkwardness resulting from the presence of two possessive genitives, namely ἄνακτος and στρατοῦ73.

22. Rh. 333–41

Εκ. μισῶ φίλοισιν ὕστερον βοηδρομεῖν.  333
ὁ δ’ οὖν, ἐπείπερ ἦλθε, σύμμαχος μὲν οὔ,  336
ἕνος δὲ πρὸς τρωπειξαν ἢκέτω ἐξέπνοι
χάρις γὰρ αὐτῷ Πριαμίδων διώλετο.  338
Χο. ἄναξ, ἀπωθεῖν συμμάχους ἐπίθεον.  334
Ἀγ. φόβος γένοιτ’ ἄν πολεμίοις ὀφθεὶς μόνον.  335
Εκ. σύ τ’ εὖ παραινεῖς, καὶ σὺ καιρίως σκοπεῖς.  339
ὁ χρυσοτευχὴς δ’ οὕνεκ’ ἀρχέλου λόγων
Ῥῆσος παρέστω τῇδε σύμμαχος χθονί.

72 Cf. ἔναντα Morstadt, Beitrag (supra, n. 40) 20 n. 2, adopted by Kovacs, Euripides (supra, n. 16): ‘marching right up [to the advance scouts]; ἔναντα Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 88, ’moving up close [to the scouts]; ἄν’ αὐτούς’ N. Wecklein, SBAWMünchen, philos.-philol.-histor. Classe, 1897, 494; cf. further F. H. M. Blaydes, Adversaria critica in Euripidem, Halle 1901, 4.

73 The clumsiness is well brought out by Vater’s paraphrase (Euripidis Rhesus, supra, n. 45) ad 285: ‘Admodum enim ieium est: interrogavi antecursores eius, qui praefuit exercitu, cum expectaveris: antecursores exercitus’.
‘(HECTOR) I hate it when one is late in assisting friends. But anyway, since he is now here, let him come — not as an ally but as a guest-friend at his hosts’ table; for the favour of Priam’s family toward him has vanished. (CHORUS) My lord, it is invidious to push away one’s allies. (MESSENGER) He would strike terror in the enemy merely by being seen. (HECTOR) ‘(To the coryphaeus) Your advice is good. (To the messenger) And your considerations are timely. Let then gold-armoured Rhesus, as this messenger’s report has it, come as an ally to this land.’

There are a number of issues here, including the attribution of speaking parts, the correct order of lines, and the question whether deletion of lines is to be practised.

(1) As far as attribution of parts is concerned, none of the arrangements in the mss. is satisfactory. OV give 334-8 to the shepherd, and 339-41 to the chorus, but the chorus of soldiers cannot have the last word in the matter of accepting Rhesus as an ally. Moreover, there can be no doubt that only Hector has the authority to speak 336-8, and L is right in giving him these lines. But then 339-41 cannot be part of the same speech by Hector (thus Q, although all other mss give these lines to the chorus), because if 340-1 (‘let Rhesus come as an ally’) follow shortly after 336-8 (‘let Rhesus come, but not as an ally’), the result is an irreducible contradiction. Moreover, 339 is problematic: it clearly addresses two speakers, although for the last twenty lines Hector has only been conversing with the coryphaeus. Taplin, who wants the messenger to depart after 316, envisages ‘some textual trouble, or even an author’s incompetence, in lines 333-41, especially 339-41’. But this is unhelpfully vague, and at any rate Taplin himself shows that not all tragic messengers depart after they have delivered their report — certainly not in this play, where the second messenger (Rhesus’ charioteer) indubitably stays on even after he has delivered his messenger speech (833ff.).

(2) Clearly, no satisfactory attribution of speaking parts is possible unless the lines are rearranged, or excision resorted to. Should one opt for the
former, Nauck’s\textsuperscript{80} brilliant transposition of lines (336-8 after 333, and 334-5 before 339) is one’s best bet, and it has been accepted with good reason by Murray, Diggle, Kovacs, and Jouan. With Nauck’s rearrangement, 336-8 and 340-1 will be spoken by the only person in authority to make such decisions, namely Hector. As for 334 and 335, the former will have to be spoken by the chorus, who thus add a concluding argument to their appeal against rejecting Rhesus (327-8, 330, 332), while the latter with its emphasis on φόβος surely belongs to the shepherd, who has already emphasized Rhesus’ power to frighten the enemy (287-9, 306-8). Attribution of 334-5 to two different speakers can hardly be bettered as a means of making sense of the double address in the immediately following 339, and has rightly been accepted by all recent editors. It is true that with this rearrangement Hector in 339-41 may appear to be yielding to the chorus’ and the shepherd’s arguments all too easily, an attitude which, according to Rosivach, would make the commander-in-chief to ‘look like a fickle ninny’\textsuperscript{81}. But Hector has already shown himself prone to bow to public opinion (137), and I do not see why his present \textit{volte-face} is any more jarring than the one in 137. At any rate, it will be seen that Hector’s change of mind is less abrupt than one may perhaps realize (below, after (4)).

(3) Another solution, offered by M. L. West\textsuperscript{82}, is to assume that 336-8 and 339-41 are ‘alternative endings for the same scene which have coalesced.’ On this hypothesis, Hector’s unconditional acceptance of Rhesus as a fully-fledged ally in 339-41 could only have come after an expostulation, now lost, which would have preceded 339. Indeed, Rosivach\textsuperscript{83} had already suggested placing a lacuna between 338 and 339 — one in which the chorus and perhaps also the shepherd would have expatiated on such arguments as are raised in 332, 334, 335. In a similar vein, Klyve\textsuperscript{84} envisages a lacuna between 334 and 335. But it is undesirable to use a lacuna as a \textit{passe-partout} textual remedy when more cautious measures may lie to hand. Alternatively, on West’s hypothesis, one may choose to excise 339-41 and interpret 336-8 as indicating that Hector accepts Rhesus ‘only as a guest, postponing a final acceptance until he has had a chance to call him to account’\textsuperscript{85}. However, having the debate end on 338 would create an inconsistency with the following scene, where Hector, despite taking Rhesus to task for his belatedness, never as much as insinuates

\textsuperscript{80} Nauck, “Studien” (\textit{supra}, n. 20) 171-3.
\textsuperscript{82} ap. Klyve, \textit{Commentary} (\textit{supra}, n. 81) p. 225.
\textsuperscript{83} “Hector” (\textit{supra}, n. 81) 58 with n. 12.
\textsuperscript{84} Commentary (\textit{supra}, n. 81) p. 225-6.
\textsuperscript{85} Quotation from Klyve, \textit{l.c.} (\textit{supra}, n. 84).
that the latter would be welcome only as a guest-friend, not as an ally, as 336-8 seem to imply.

(4) There is, finally, a third possibility, which however carries very little conviction. This is Zanetto’s (cf. Euripides Rhesus [supra, n. 49]) transposition of 336-8 to follow 328, and of 339-41 to follow 335. Line 338 is now given to the chorus and takes the form of a surprised and incredulous question: χάρις ... διώλετο; ‘what! Are the Priamids no longer grateful to Rhesus?’ This is highly unlikely. First of all, ‘we have sufficient men to defend Ilion’ (329) does not follow very well after 338 — one should rather expect a comment on Rhesus’ having fallen from grace. On the other hand, Hector’s proud retort in 329 is very much apposite after the chorus’ pointing out that an ally should always be welcome (328). Secondly, Hector’s capitulation in 336-7 (‘fine, let Rhesus sit as a guest at our table’) would come as a complete surprise after only two lines of argumentation by the chorus (327-8), whereas it is more at home after the brief altercation in 329-32.

On balance, it seems best to keep the text as rearranged by Nauck. It is true that 336-8 and 339-41 may seem at first sight to be ‘alternative endings which have coalesced’, to repeat West’s phrase (see (3) above). However, this is a false impression. The process of convincing Hector to accept Rhesus as an ally is both longer and smoother than has perhaps been realized, and the Trojan prince’s attitude cannot be dismissed as ‘fatuous’, despite e.g. Pearson.

Hector starts off by dismissing Rhesus’ professed friendship and loyalty as mere sham (319-26); nine lines later, however, he concedes that Rhesus may come as a guest-friend, although he is certainly unwilling to have him as an ally (336-8); finally, after the chorus and the messenger put in their final arguments (334-5), Hector agrees to have Rhesus fight as a fully-fledged Trojan ally (339-41). For this gradual process to be delineated (passably, though by no means adequately), both 336-8 and 339-41 are indispensable.

23. Rh. 336-8

For the text see item 22 above. As pointed out by Beck, line 338 seems to be cited in Eustathius (Comm. Iliad. p. 822.5-6, III.123.25-6 van der Valk): συντέθνηκε κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἢ ἐκ τῶν Τρώων χάρις τῷ Ῥήσῳ, ‘as the proverb has it, the Trojan’s gratitude has died together with Rhesus.’ The situation envisaged in the Eust. passage appears to be one in which the Trojans refuse to pursue Rhesus’ murderers because they feel they are no longer indebted to him. This is most certainly not how matters stand in Rhesus, and so Morstadt imagined that Eust. can only be referring to a
different *Rhesus* — presumably the genuine Euripidean play. However, Eustathius’ referring to the passage as a παρομοία strongly suggests that he is quoting from a gnomologium, and therefore out of context; this surely accounts for the inaccuracy pointed out by Morstadt.

As for διώλετο (OVQ) *vs.* ἀπώλετο (L), it seems, pace Diggle, that the latter is to be preferred. As a rule, διώλυμαι emphasizes the role of an external agency in effecting the perishing or coming to nought⁹⁰; by contrast, ἀπόλλυμαι (or the simplex ὄλλυμαι) can mean merely ‘to cease to exist, to fail’, and is apparently the * vox propria* to be used with regard to loss of χάρις; cf. E. Hcld. 438 οὔτοι σοὶ γ’ ἀπόλλυται χάρις; fr. 736.5–6 Kannicht ἡ δ’ ἐν όρθολοις χάρις | ἀπολολ’;⁹¹ S. fr. 920 ἀμνήμονος γὰρ ἀνδρός ὄλλυται χάρις.

24. *Rh.* 335

For the Greek text see item 22 above. Evidently, φόβος here is used in the sense ‘object or cause of fear’; cf. LSJ⁹² s.v., II.2; S. OT 917 ἧν φόβου λέγη; OC 1651–2 ὃς δεινοῦ τινος | φόβου φανέντος. Alternatively, one might capitalize: Φόβος γένοντ’ ἐν πολεμίοις, ‘Rhesus would become Phobos (= as terrifying as Ph.) for the enemy.’ The reference would then be to Phobos, Ares’ son or attendant⁹³, a personification of the terror that puts warriors to flight⁹⁴. For a redoubtable warrior being assimilated to Phobos cf. A. Sept. 500, where Hippomedon ‘boasts of being Phobos at the gates’⁹⁵; cf. Sept. 574 for Tydeus as πρόσπολον Φόβου (v.l. φόνου). A key passage in this connection is Il. 13.298–300 (see Janko ad l.), where Meriones is likened to Ares, and Idomeneus (implicitly) to Phobos. Note that Rhesus is compared to Ares himself in *Rhesus* 385–7. For the use of divine names in predicate function, whereby one ‘is’ or ‘becomes’ this or that divinity, cf. e.g. E. Tr.

---

⁹⁰ Examples from tragedy include: A. Pers. 483–4 στρατός ... | διώλυθθ; S. Tr. 1052 ύπατον ἀμφιβλητρόν, ὃ διώλυμαι; El. 141 ἄλτε στενάξοσα διώλυσα (‘you’re ruining yourself’); OT 225 ἀνδρός ἐκ τίνος διώλετο; E. fr. 757.848 Κτ. διά σὲ γὰρ διώλυμαι (whereas in the same fragment’s line 845, when there was no emphasis on a third party’s agency, Hypsipyle had said merely ὃς ἀπόλλυμαι κακός); Hipp. 909 τῷ τρόπῳ διώλυται; (Hippolytus is seeking to ascertain the agent of Phaedra’s death); 1061 ὅφ’ ὑμών ... διώλυμαι; 1305 προφοῦ διώλετ’ ὧν ἐκούσα μηχαναῖς; Andr. 158 ἐκ τὰ ἀκύμων διά σὲ μοι διώλυται; Tro. 629 ὃς κακός διώλυσα (of the slaughtered Polyxena); Su. 191–2 οὐ χρείας πόλεις | πολλαὶ διώλοντ’; Or. 1512 Ἡ Τυνδάρειος ... παῖς διώλυτος.


⁹³ Hom. II. 15.119; Hes. Sc. 195.

⁹⁴ Cf. Hom. II. 4.440, 15.119; A. Sept. 45 (with Tucker, Hutchinson ad l.), 574.

⁹⁵ As Rose ad l. argues, Φόβος γὰρ ἧν πρὸς πῦλας κομπόστησα means that Hippomedon, who is ‘inspired by Ares’ (497 ἐνθεὸς δ’ Ἄρει) and ‘with a horrifying look in his eyes’ (498 φόβον βλέπον), is assimilated with Phobos. Contra, however, Hutchinson.
25. Rh. 339-41

For the Greek text see item 22 above. Herwerden\textsuperscript{97} thought that the two \( σύ \) refer to the same person (an impossibility), and went on to emend into \( σύ \ γ' εὖ \ παρατείνει καὶ τὸ καύτερον σκοτεῖς. \) However, the use of \( σύ \ ... \) \( σύ \) with reference to two different interlocutors is an established usage. As tragic instances, Nauck\textsuperscript{98} cites S. \( OT \) 637 \( οὐκ \ εἶ \ σύ τ' \) (i.e. Oedipus) \( οἴκους \) \( σύ \) \( τε, \) Κρόνον, κατὰ στέγας...; \( Ant. \) 724-5 \( ἀναξ, \) \( σέ \ τ' εἰκός, \) \( εἰ \) \( τι \) \( καύτερον \) \( λέγει, \) | \( μαθεῖν, \) \( σέ \ τ' \) (i.e. Haemon) \( σὺ \) \( τοῦδ', \) 1340-1 \( δ' \) \( παί, \) \( σέ \) \( τ' \) οὖ \( έκόν \) \( κατέκαυσον | \( σέ \) \( τ' \) αὐ \( τάνδ', \) (i.e. Eurydice); E. \( IT \) 657 \( σὲ \) (i.e. Orestes) \( πάρος \) \( η \) \( σ' \) (i.e. Pylades) \( ἀνακοσμάξων χόος; \) 1069 \( σὲ \) καὶ \( σ' \) \( κατέκαυσε, \) \( σὲ \) \( δὲ \) \( φίλης \) \( παρηήδος \) (i.e. several members of the chorus); \( IT \) 1079 \( σὸν \) \( έρων \) \( ήδη καὶ \) \( σὸν \) \( ἱκνοῦμαι, \) \( σὲ \) \( δὲ \) \( φίλης \) \( παρηήδος \) (ditto); \( Ph. \) 568 \( σὲ \) \( μὲν \) (i.e. Eteocles) \( τάδ' \) \( αὐτῶν \) \( σοὶ \) \( δέ, \) Πολύνεικες, \( λέγω. \)

With regard to \( οὕνεκ' \) \( ἀγγέλου \) \( λόγων, \) Pearson claimed that the paradosis cannot ‘be merely the equivalent of “if we may believe the messenger” — with or without innuendo’\textsuperscript{99}. He thus went on to emend into \( οὐκ \) \( ἐν \) \( ἀγγέλου \) \( λόγῳ, \) ‘Rhesus in his golden armour shall come before us, no longer through the medium of a messenger’s tale.’ But it would be otiose to point out that Rhesus will appear in person rather than through a messenger’s report — unless one should want to have Hector suddenly all aflutter and anxious to see Rhesus face to face, which would be starkly inconsistent with his attitude so far.

26. Rh. 360-4

\( \text{ἐρά ποτ' \ αὐθίς ἀ παλαία Τροία } 360 \\
\text{τοὺς προπότας παναμερεύ-} \\
\text{σει θαύμας \ έρώτων} \\
\text{ψάλμοισι καὶ κυλίκων \ οίνοπλανήτοις} \\
\text{ἐπιδεξίοις \ άμίλλαιοις ... ;} \\
\text{363 \ ψάλμοισι \ Canter: \ ψάλμασι \ \( Ω \) \ 364 \ \text{ἐπιδεξίοις} \ \text{L. Dindorf (-ας \ \text{iam}} \\
\text{Musgrave): \ ύποδεξίοις \ \( \text{O, -ας} \ \text{VLQ \ \text{et \ Σν}})}, \text{\( \nu \)} 96

\( \text{Notwithstanding the scepticism of M. L. West, BICS 26, 1979, 112 with n. 18.} \)
\( \text{(supra, n. 28) 32.} \)
\( \text{Nauck, “Studien” (supra, n. 20) 172 n. 1.} \)
\( \text{A. C. Pearson, “Some Passages of Greek Tragedy”, CQ 11, 1917, 57-68, here 60; cf. \text{idem,}} \)
\( \text{CQ 12, 1918, 79.} \)
'Will Troy of old ever again hold celebrations all day long with bands of toasting revellers, accompanied by love songs and the contest of wine cups wandering ever to the right...?'

Canter’s indispensable emendation of mss. φάλμασι (a transcription error going back to a minuscule original: οι > α) restores responsion with 373. Pace\(^{100}\), endorsed by Delle Donne,\(^{101}\) keeps the tradition, assuming ‘free responsion’ between a choriamb (φάλμασι καὶ) and an iamb (σχιστὰν παρ’ ἄντ‐); but the parallels she adduces are all easily emendable\(^{102}\); on the dubiety of the Responsionsfreiheit device see item 7 above.

With regard to ἐπίδεξιος, L. Dindorf’s\(^{103}\) emendation seems unassailable, even though ἐπίδεξιος is unattested in tragedy.\(^{104}\) For the symptic custom indicated by ἐπίδεξιος cf. Crit. fr. 6.6 West προσόσεις ὀφέγειν ἐπίδεξια; Eup. fr. 354 Kassel–Austin ὅταν ... πίνωσι τὴν ἐπίδεξια; idem fr. 395.1 Kassel–Austin δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπίδεξια with K–A in app. crit. ad l. Dindorf’s emendation has been contested by Pace\(^{105}\), who reverts to the lectio tradita ὑποδεξίαις (VLQ and Σ\(\nu\)ad 364) or -ξίοις (O), for which she posits an otherwise unattested meaning ‘welcoming, hospitable’ (‘che riceve, che accoglie, che ospita’).

27. Rh. 370-4

"ἔλθε φάνηθι, τὰν ζάχρυσον προβάλον 370
Πηλείδα κατ’ ὄμμα πέλ‐
tαν δοχμίαν πεδαίρων
σχιστὰν παρ’ ἄντυγα, πώλους ἐρεθίζων
dίβολόν τ’ ἄκοντα πάλλων.

‘Come, appear, hold before you your solid-gold peltê as you face Peleus’ son, raising it aslant over the bifurcating chariot-rail, goading your mares and flourishing your two-pronged spear.’

My translation follows Diggle’s punctuation at 373 (comma after ἄντυγα). Alternatively, one could punctuate after πεδαίρων in 372, and take σχιστὰν

\(^{100}\) Reso (supra, n. 36) 39–40.
\(^{101}\) “In margine” (supra, n. 39) 199.
\(^{102}\) A. Sept. 736 γαῖα Dindorf alii alia (χθονία mss.); S. Phil. 1100 λωίονος Bothe alii alia (τοῦ λωίονος mss.); 1138 mss. ἀνατέλ-(λονθ’) could be emended into ἐπανατέλ‐; in E. Hchld. 915 read ἐρατὸν Par. gr. 287, Ald. (ἐραστόν L), in 924 ἔσχεν δ’ ὕβριν (Heath: ἔσχε δ’ ὕβρεις mss.); in Hel. 1340 read ἐνέπει (Heath: ἐνν- L).
\(^{103}\) In Thesaurus Graecae Linguae vol. 3 s.v. ἐπίδεξιος, col. 1568.
\(^{105}\) “Note” (supra, n. 22) 455–8.
... ἐρεθίζων to mean 'goading your mares past, or beyond, i.e. over the edge of, the split chariot-rail' (Rhesus' whip or reins would naturally pass over the rail); for this use of παρά see LSJ9 s.v., C.III.1; cf. especially Ar. Av. 390-1 παρ’ αὐτήν τὴν χύτραν ἀκραν ὀρθώντας, with Dunbar ad l.

28. Rh. 385-7

θεός, ὡ Τροία, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης
ὁ Στρυμόνιος πῶλος αἰοίδος
Μούσης ἥκων καταπνεῖ se.

'A god, O Troy, a god, Ares himself — the colt born of Strymon and Muse the singer has arrived and breathes upon you.'

An accusative governed by καταπνέω denotes that which comes out with one's breath, not that which is breathed upon or over (except in late Greek, e.g. Heliod. 3.2.1 τὸν τόπον εὐωδία κατέπνεον); in E. Med. 838-40 one now generally reads τὰν Κύπριν κληζώντιν ... χώρας (Reiske : χώραν ms.) καταπνεύσαι ... ἀνέμων ... αὔρας. It follows that καταπνεῖ σε cannot mean 'breathes upon you'. Such a meaning could only be obtained if the object of καταπνεῖ were either in the genitive (governed by κατα-, cf. E. Med. 838-40 above, and Ar. Lys. 552 ἔμερον ἡμῶν κατὰ τῶν κόλπων ... καταπνεύσῃ, unless ἡμῶν is possessive genitive) or in the dative, as in Pl. Com. fr. 189.15 Kassel–Austin μὴ σοι νέμεσις θεόθεν καταπνεύσῃ, or in the closely parallel Archestr. SH 146.3-4 = fr. 16.3-4 Olson / Sens μὴ σοι νέμεσις καταπνεύσῃ | ... ἀπ’ ἀθανάτων with Olson / Sens ad l. As the genitive seems to be used only in conjunction with an accusative object (καταπνεῖν τί τινος), we should probably change σε into σοι here; so also Feickert, Rhesus (supra, n. 92) ad 387.

29. Rh. 388-9

χαῖρ’, ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖ, τύραννε τήδε χής,
'Εκτόρ, παλαιὰ σ’ ἡμέρα προσεννέτω
388 ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖ Q et Chr. Pat. 2098, 2538: ἐ- ἐ- παῖς L: ἐσθλοῦ παῖ V: ἐσθλοῦ πατρός παῖ O u. delere paene malit Diggle (uide Willink ad Or. 71-2)

'Hail, noble son of a noble father, monarch of this land, Hector; it is after a long time that I greet you.'
The readings of O and V are obviously unmetrical, but the L could be right\textsuperscript{106}, although the vocative παί coupled with the nominative ἐσθλός (which is not attested in the vocative, at least in tragedy\textsuperscript{107}) makes for a \textit{lectio difficilior}\textsuperscript{108}. Addresses extending over more than one line often come under suspicion (see Willink \textit{ad} E. Or. 71-2), and Diggle (\textit{app. crit. ad l.}) was tempted to delete line 388. But the addresses cited by Willink \textit{l.c.} as probably interpolated follow a set pattern, namely ω + vocative; \textit{Rh.} 388 deviates from it in having χαίρε open the line, and in lacking ω. This may or may not be sufficient reason to keep the line, but surely one cannot lump the present passage together with the group of interpolated addresses discussed by Willink.

30. \textit{Rh.} 422-3

\begin{verbatim}
toioutilos eimi kaiutos, eutheian logon
temnov kelleivon, kou diplous pefruk' anero,
423 temnow (uel temneiv) Nauck, cl. Cycl. 524, Or. 895, fr. 196

'I am myself such a man too, following a straight path in my speech, and am not duplicitous.'
\end{verbatim}

A demonstrative expanded on by a following participle (τέμνων) does not seem to be a common tragic usage. The closest parallel I was able to find is A. Ag. 312-13 τοιοide to mou lamipadhiporon nomoi, | alllos par' allou diadochais pleroimeno. As Fraenkel \textit{ad l.} explains, 'The binding arrangements (νόμοι) which Clytemnestra has made for the torch-racers consist in their being alllos par' allou diadochais pleroimeno.'\textsuperscript{109}

Thus, there seem to be some grounds for turning to Nauck's\textsuperscript{110} τέμνω or τέμνειν; indeed, the case for his emendation(s) may be even stronger than Nauck himself perhaps realized. For the indicative following and explicating a demonstrative Nauck cites only E. Cyc. 524 τοιοσδ' ο δαιμον' ουδενα βλαττει βροτων, Or. 895 το γαρ γενος τοιουτον' επι τον ευτυχη | πηδοσ' οει κηρυκες (Dindorf's deletion of the passage is immaterial), and fr. 196.1-3 Kannicht. But one should also take into account E. Andr. 173ff., Su. 881ff.,

\textsuperscript{106} Diggle, \textit{Euripidea (supra, n. 4)} 324 n. 10.

\textsuperscript{107} Cf. Diggle, \textit{l.c. (supra, n. 106).}

\textsuperscript{108} The coupling of vocative and nominative in addresses is ancient and well attested; e.g. Hom. \textit{Il.} 4.149 φιλος οι Μενελαος; E. \textit{Andr.} 348 ο τλημων δενε (αντι Dindorf); S. Aj. 923 ο δυσμορ' Ατας (Αιαν Suda); see further Kühner–Gerth (\textit{supra, n. 22}) 1, 48; West \textit{ad} Hes. \textit{Theog.} 964; Wackernagel, \textit{Vorlesungen (supra, n. 30)} 7, 306-7 = \textit{Lectures 14, 385}; Diggle, \textit{Euripidea (supra, n. 4)} 324 n. 10.

\textsuperscript{109} Less close is A. Pers. 236 και στρατος τοιουτος, ερξας πολλα δη Μηδους κακα, where τοιουτος, ερξας is not the same as τοιουτος, οστε ερξαι, hence Bothe's ερξαι, 'such as to have caused'. See further A. F. Garvie (ed.), \textit{Aeschylus: Persae}, Oxford 2009, \textit{ad} 235-6.

\textsuperscript{110} "Studien" (\textit{supra, n. 20}) 173-4.
fr. 322.1-3 Kannicht and, for the infinitive after τοιόθεν, IA 502-3 ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ τρόποι | τοιόθεν, χρῆσθαι τοίς βελτίστοις ἄει. The passage should then be translated: ‘I am myself such a man too: I follow a straight path’ etc., or (with the infinitive) ‘I am such a man as to follow’ etc. As David Kovacs points out to me (per litteras), the indicative seems slightly preferable, since it parallels πέφυκ’. The corruption into τέμνων could be explained from the fact that the following word and the two preceding words also end in –ν.

31. Rh. 438-42

οὐχ ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας
οὐδ’ ἐν ζαχρύσοι δῶμασιν κοιμώμενος,
ἀλλ’ οἶα πόντον θρῄσκον φυσήματα
κρυσταλλόσπηκτος Παίονάς τ’ ἐπεξάρει
ξύν τοίσδ’ ἐμπροσθ’ ὑπὸνος οἶδα τλάς πορτάμασιν.

‘Nothing to do with that “deep drinking” of mine you rant about, nor with my lying in all-gold chambers; but I know what ice-frozen winds vexed the Thracian sea and the Paeonians, for I have suffered them without sleep in this cloak of mine.’

These lines contain an exceptionally harsh anacoluthon. Rather than being a self-standing comparative clause, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς (438) spills over into ἀμύστιδας, itself governed by κομπεῖς; on the other hand, κοιμώμενος (439), although connected with 438 by οὐδ’, is syntactically unrelated with it, for it continues the participial syntax of 436-7 (περάσας … περῶν). A further anacoluthon occurs in 440 where ἀλλ’, instead of providing a link with the preceding participial clause, introduces a principal clause with οἶδα (442) as the main verb; for this kind of anacoluthon cf. e.g. Thuc. 1.67.2 φανερῶς μὲν οὐ πρεσβευόμενοι … κρύφα δὲ … ἐνῆγον (Kühner–Gerth [supra, n. 22] ii 100, 4). On the whole, the anacoluthon is only partly paralleled by E. Ba. 683-8 (adduced by Porter ad l.)\textsuperscript{111}, a passage in which, although the syntax is indeed abruptly transformed under the influence of a verbum dicendi (φῆς 686), the accusativus cum infinitivo (ἀμύστιδας … θηρᾶν … ἥρημωμένας) is much more regular than the simple accusativus objecti (ἀμύστιδας) here (see further Jebb on S. Tr. 1238f.). Matthiae, followed by Klyve\textsuperscript{112}, assumes a zeugma: οὐδ’ (sic), ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς, ἀμύστιδας δεξιούμενος (cf. 419); but no stretch of syntactic goodwill will supply δεξιούμενος from κοιμώμενος in 439, to say nothing of the fact that an intransitive verb such as κοιμῶμαι

\textsuperscript{111} See W. H. Porter (ed.), The Rhesus of Euripides, Cambridge 1929\textsuperscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{112} Matthiae, Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 45) ad 435; Klyve, Commentary (supra, n. 81) ad 435.
cannot be involved in this type of zeugma (cf. Kühner–Gerth [supra, n. 22] 2, 570-1). And it will not do to posit, as Vater hesitantly suggests, a lacuna after 438: as a quasi-quotation of Hector’s sarcastic reference in 419, τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας must be governed by κομπεῖς. Herwerden’s rewriting of 438, οὐκ ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς <σπῶν πυκνὰς> ἀμύστιδας, would remove the anacoluthon but is too far removed from the paradosis. The anacoluthon, it seems, is authorial.

32. Rh. 443

ἀλλ’ ύπτερος μὲν ἧλθον, ἐν καιρῷ δ’ ὁμως
ὑπτερος Cobet: -ον ΩgV et Chr. Pat. 1728 εις καιρόν Chr. Pat.

‘Alright then, I may have come late, but my arrival is timely nonetheless.’

Contrary to the majority of the mss. and the consensus of editors, ες καιρόν is probably to be read here (cf. εις καιρόν Chr. Pat. 1728 : εν καιρῷ mss.). Tragic idiom seems to prefer ες καιρόν after verbs of motion, although this of course can be no hard-and-fast rule. Cf. also the instances of εις καλόν / εν καλῶ cited by P. T. Stevens, Colloquial expressions in Euripides, Wiesbaden 1976, 28 and by Dawe ad S. OT 78.

33. Rh. 451-3

ὑμῶν δὲ μή τις ἀσπίδ’ ἀρηται χερί·
ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἕξω† τοὺς μέγ’ αὐχοῦντας δορὶ
πέρσας Ἀχαιοὺς, καταπερ ύπτερος μολόν.
451 ἄρηται l. dindorf: αἴρηται Christ: αἱρεῖται Q, αἱρετω L 452 ἔγωγ’ ἄρηξω Kirchhoff 452-3 ἔξωτα…πέρσας Ω: ήκω … πέρσαν Nauck, ἀρκό (Holzner) … πορθεῖν uel ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ … πέρσας Diggle hos uu. del. Herwerden

113 Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 425.
114 H. van Herwerden, “Novae commentationes Euripideae”, RPh 18, 1894, 60-98, here 84.
116 e.g. Rh. 52 ες καιρόν ἦλθες, E. Hel. 1081 ες καιρόν ἥλθε, Hipp. 899, Hec. 666, Herc. 701, Ph. 106, Or. 384; S. Aj. 1168.
117 Cf. E. fr. 727c.39 Kn. ἐν δέοντι δ’ ἥλθες, Alc. 817, Or. 212, as against ες δεον in E. Alc. 1101, S. OT 1416.
'As for you, let no one take up a shield with his hand; for I will stay(?) the boastful Greeks, vanquishing them with my spear, much as I have arrived belatedly.'

In 451, ἀρηταί is a suggestion by L. Dindorf. Of the variants mentioned in Diggle's app. crit., only the Q is linguistically possible, though inferior due to its durative verbal aspect: what Rhesus demands is that the Trojans give up war, once and for all.

Far greater difficulties are presented by ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἕξω†. The problem with ἐξοω is that its meaning 'successfully to sustain an attack' (e.g. Hom. II. 11.820, 12.166, 13.51, 20.27; figurative in Pi. fr. 232 Snell–Maehler) is incompatible with the fact that in this play the Greeks have been on the defensive (56-64), and it is Rhesus who will be the assailing. Indeed, ἐχω and κατέχω are elsewhere used by Hector with regard to his vanquishing of the Greeks, cf. Rh. 60 οὐταν ἔγον ... δόρυ; 101 ὀχημα καθέξω. Kirchhoff's ἔγοι' ἀρηταί, 'I shall aid 'you', i.e. by vanquishing the boastful Greeks in battle, is neat and paleographically plausible. However, in tragedy the object of ἀρηταί does not seem ever to be omitted, except in exhortations. Moreover, as Nauck intimates, 'I shall aid' the Trojans is no doubt too modest a promise from a man who has claimed to be able to vanquish the entire Greek army in a single day. Nauck's (l.c.) alternative suggestion ἐγὼ γὰρ ἥκω ... πέρσαι (for I have come in order to vanquish...) is also simple and elegant, but it would be hard to imagine how and why it was corrupted into ἐξοω ... πέρσαι (the presumed change in the tense of the participle seems particularly puzzling).

Minimal change is involved in a suggestion that occurred independently to Diggle and to Kovacs, namely ἐγὼ γὰρ ἥξω κτλ, 'I shall come back having plundered the boastful Achaeans'. But although this is admirably economical, it perhaps places undue emphasis on the idea of Rhesus' coming back from his aristeia, when Rhesus has just stressed that he will immediately go away...
(450) after defeating the Greeks. In support of ἥξω + aorist participle to describe performing a feat and returning to tell about it (with no particular emphasis on the returning) Kovacs in private correspondence points me to a number of alleged parallels: E. Alc. 488 κτανὼν ἄρ’ ἥξεις ἤ θανὼν αὐτοῦ μενεῖς; Hec. 930-2 παιδες Ἦλλανον, πότε δὴ πότε τάν | Ἡλίῳ ακοπιάν | πέρσαντες ἥξετ’ οὐκοιο;: Tro. 460-1 ἥξω δ’ ἐς νεκροὺς νικηφόρος | καὶ δόμους πέρσας | Ἀτρείδων; Rh. 156-7 καὶ πάντ’ ἂρχοιν ἐκμαθὼν βουλεύματα | ἥξω. However, in all these instances the idea of returning or of arriving is crucial to the passage’s point: in Hec. ἥξετ’ describes a goal of primary importance; in Tro. Cassandra envisages a triumphant arrival in Hades; in Rh. Dolon’s coming back from his spying mission is an essential prerequisite for its success; and in Alc. ἥξεις is contrasted to μενεῖς, an eventuality which (as already noted) is to be excluded in Rh. 451-3. I can find no satisfactory parallel for the use of aorist participle + ἥκω (vel sim.) to emphasize primarily the act denoted by the participle rather than by ἥκω; the syntagm does not merely signify ‘I’ll get the job done and come back with the news’ (i.e. ‘I’ll be my own messenger before going back home to Thrace’), as Kovacs maintains, but rather ‘I will return after performing the task’.

Diggle’s alternative suggestions ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀρκῶ (Holzner) … πορθεῖν (‘for I am strong enough to vanquish...’) or ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ … πέρσας (‘for I shall succour <you> by vanquishing...’), cf. LSJ s.v. ἐξαρκέω III, although the ellipsis of object seems unidiomatic) are ingenious but too far removed from the tradition.

No satisfactory expedient lies to hand, unless one wants to consider a solution of despair: ἥξω could be after all what the author wrote, presumably under the mistaken impression that ἥξω in the Iliadic passages cited above means generally ‘to vanquish’ rather than ‘to repel an attacker’; cf. especially Od. 22.171-2 μνηστῆρας … σχήσομεν ἔντοσθε μεγάρων, which is particularly liable to such a misunderstanding, since the suitors there are not attackers, and σχήσομεν = ‘we shall vanquish’ seems (deceptively) plausible.

34. Rh. 458-60

τὸ δὲ νάιον Ἀργόθεν δόρυ
οὔτε πρίν τιν’ οὔτε νῦν
ἀνδρῶν ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω.

459 τιν’ οὔτε νῦν Nauck: οὔτε νῦν τιν’ Ω

‘As for the ships from Argos, they have never —neither before nor now— brought [here] a man superior to you.’

126 As J. Gregory points out (Euripides: Hecuba, Atlanta 1999, ad 932), the goals of sacking Troy and returning home are traditionally linked.
As Willink remarked\textsuperscript{127}, Nauck’s easy transposition ‘postulates only that τιν was skipped after πριν and later restored in the wrong place.’ More complicated is Ritchie’s\textsuperscript{128} οὔτε πρὶν <ποτ’> οὔτε νῦν τιν’, since it requires ἔβριξα | μά in the antistrophe (825-6, with initial anceps in the enoplian at 826). Pace\textsuperscript{129} keeps the ms. reading, divides after τιν’ ἀνδρῶν, and scans the result as choriamb + penthemimer (i.e. theolarion x —∪— x)\textsuperscript{130}. This poses several problems. First, it mars responsion with 825, which Pace scans as a lekythion — since she misguidedly denies that the two stanzas correspond in the first place\textsuperscript{131}. Secondly, Pace’s colometry leaves us with the ensuing colon ∪∪—∪∪— (ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω), which is hard to make sense of\textsuperscript{132}.

35. \textit{Rh.} 467-8

\begin{quote}
tοιαῦτα μὲν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
πρᾶξαι παρέξω.
\end{quote}

The intended meaning seems to be ‘Such is the compensation I will allow you to exact for my long absence’, looking back to Rhesus’ pledge in 447-53\textsuperscript{133}. Kovacs\textsuperscript{134} finds “I will allow you to exact such things” hard to make sense of, especially since in his immediately preceding lines 451-3 [Rhesus] forbids the Trojans to do anything to the Greeks and promises he will do it alone; moreover, Kovacs complains, ‘τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας has no obvious construction.’ Therefore, he argues, something must have fallen out after 467, e. g. ἤ δυσχεραίνεις, ἄξι’ ὠφελήματα, so that the run of the sentence may be ‘I shall allow you to exact from me <a benefit that befits> my long absence, <at which you take offence’}. In Kovacs’ restoration, τοιαῦτα <ὠφελήματα> would be pointing ahead to the attack against Greece that Rhesus proposes.

\textsuperscript{127} Willink, “Cantica” (\textit{supra}, n. 9) 37 = \textit{Collected Papers} 576.
\textsuperscript{128} Ritchie, \textit{Authenticity} (\textit{supra} n. 8) 311.
\textsuperscript{129} Reso (\textit{supra}, n. 36) 41-2.
\textsuperscript{131} Cf. also G. Pace, “[E.] \textit{Rh.} 454-466: 820-832”, \textit{QUCC} 65, 2000, 127-39; endorsed by Delle Donne, “In margine” (\textit{supra}, n. 39) 180-1, 193-4. Pace’s idiosyncratic colometry earned her some sharp criticisms from Willink, “Cantica” (\textit{supra}, n. 9) 33-7 = \textit{Collected Papers} 572-6 passim.
\textsuperscript{132} Pace unhelpfully calls it ‘prosodiac’. One might choose to call it ‘anapaest + spondee’, but this would be to disregard the metrical context. To scan it as ∪∪—∪∪—∪∪— (cf. K. Itsumi, “Enoplian in Tragedy”, \textit{BICS} 38, 1991-1993, 243-61, here 253 with n. 29), assuming contraction of the last biceps, would be unadvisable for lack of parallels. To call it a ‘dragged’ glyconic would be impossible, for the ‘aolic base’ never takes the form ∪∪ in tragedy (Dale, \textit{Lyric Metres} [\textit{supra}, n. 38] 134-4; West, \textit{Greek Metre} [\textit{supra}, n. 130] 30).
\textsuperscript{133} Thus Lindemann, \textit{Ad annuam lustrationem} (\textit{supra}, n. 60) 12; J. Wackernagel, \textit{Glotta} 7, 1916, 161-319, here 194 n. 1.
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Euripidea Tertia} (\textit{supra}, n. 11) 147-8.
to undertake, over and above his promised defeat of the Greek aggressors, in 469-73.

Ingenious as it is, Kovac’s conjecture is open to objections. First, τοιαῦτα is probably recapitulatory (appositely so, after the eleven-line choral interlude in 454-66), with μὲν (467) contrasting the feats that Rhesus has promised to perform on behalf of the Trojans all by himself (447-53) with the additional —ἐπεὶ δ’ ἄν (469)— services he will offer, in joined effort with Hector (471 ἐξ ὑμοί), once the war is over, namely the proposed expedition against Greece (469-73). Moreover, pace Kovac, there is no real contradiction between 467-8 (Rhesus will allow Hector to benefit from his exceptional valour) and 451-3 (Rhesus’ valour needs no support from the Trojans). But even if there were such a contradiction, it would still not be an insurmountable one, since it resurfaces a little later, at 469-70, where Rhesus’ θῶμεν implies —contrary to his insistence, in 451, that no Trojan should interfere in his attack against the Greeks— that the liberation of Troy will be achieved by the joint effort of Hector and himself (a rhetorically expedient device, as it paves the way for Rhesus’ proposal of a joint expedition against Greece in the following lines, 471-3). As for Kovac’s complaint that τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας has no obvious construction, it is hard to see why it cannot be genitive of exchange / price from πρᾶξια ‘exact’ (as tribute or fine) —‘an unusual but understandable syntax’135. One may compare Rh. 192 δώρον τῆς ἐμῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας; E. Med. 534-5 (adduced by Paley136) μείζω γε μέντοι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας | εἴληφας ἢ δέδωκας; S. Tr. 287-8137 εὔτ’ ἄν ἄγνα θύματα | βέβηκεν πατρῷον Ζηνὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως.

When all is said and done, there may well be some textual corruption lurking in πρᾶξια παρέξω (cf. Diggle in app. crit). If πρ- παρ- conceal a word or words meaning compensation or requital, then a complement in the genitive would be perfectly in order. An emendation in this direction is Musgrave’s πρᾶξιν παρέξω138, ‘these things I shall offer you as a compensation for my long absence’ or perhaps (though this is doubtful) ‘as a positive outcome of my absence’, i.e. ‘I shall turn my absence into an advantage for you’; cf. LSJ s.v. πρᾶξις, I.2, VI.2, and E. IA 270-2 τὰς φυγούσας μέλαθρα | ... | πρᾶξιν Ἐλλὰς ὡς λάβοι (πρᾶξις = ‘requital’); Hom. Il. 24.524 οὗ γάρ τις πρῆξιν πέλεται ... γόοι, ‘no good comes from weeping’. But τοιαῦτα ... πρᾶξιν seems odd; Musgrave’s emendation might be improved by reading τοιάνδε ... πρᾶξιν.

137 Adduced by Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 249.
138 S. Musgrave, Exercitationum in Euripidem libri duo, Leiden 1762, 94; so also Kirchhoff, Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 121) 556 ad 457.
36. Rh. 481

οὔκουν κτανόντες τούσδε πάντες εἰργάσμεθα;
pάντες εἰργάσμεθα Q: πάνε εἰργ— OV: πάντες εἰργάσμεθ' ἄν L: cf. Σ': πάντα
dιεπραξάμεθα (διαπεπραξόμεθα Schwartz, διαπραξόμεθα Wilamowitz

‘Well then, once we have killed these men, will we not have accomplished everything?’

We can summarily dispose of the L reading139, because the notion of an unfulfilled condition it introduces is unacceptable here: Rhesus presents the eventuality of defeating the Greeks as a wholly realistic one. The Q is of course entirely in order (cf. e.g. E. Alc. 607, El. 610, 771, Hel. 53), but so is the OV: cf. E. Andr. 448-9 πάν πέριξ | φρονούντες (πάν corrupted into πάντα in some mss!); IA 1540 πάν πεύσῃ σαφῶς; fr. 800.2 Kannicht πάν 

τελοῦσα (Nauck : πάντα' ἔχοις mss); fr. 918.2 Kn. πάν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τεκτανέσθω (πάν Ar. Ach. 660, Suda π 40 Adler : πάντες Cic. Att. 8.8.2). Perhaps πάντες is slightly preferable in view of the following (482) neuter plurals τὰ πόρσω, τάγγυθεν140. But the question is a hard one to settle.

37. Rh. 496

τίς δὴ μετ' αὐτὸν ἄλλος εὐδοξεῖ στρατοῦ;
τίς δὴ LQ: τίς δὲ V: τί δαί O

‘Well then, who else after him is held in high esteem in the army?’

There is something to be said for the O reading, which I take to stem from an original τις <ς δαί. Despite its colloquial tone141, δαί is transmitted eight times in the mss. of Euripides, in questions motivated by preceding enunciations, often (as here) after the rejection of an idea or in introducing a new point142; cf. Cyc. 450, Med. 1012 (v. l. : δή, δ' αὖ are also transmitted), Hel. 1246, IA 1443 (δαί Triclinius : δή Gaisford), 1447 (δέ Gaisford, prob. Diggle), El. 244 (δ' αὖ Seidler, prob. Diggle), 1116 (δ' αὖ Nauck, prob. Diggle), Ion 275 (δή Elmsley, δ' αὖ Porson). For δαί in questions in tragedy cf. also A. Cho. 900 ποῦ δαί τὰ

140 Cf. Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 324 n. 11.
141 Cf. P. T. Stevens, Colloquial Expressions in Euripides, Wiesbaden 1976, 45-6, citing inter alia examples from comedy. On δαί as a comic colloquialism see also A. López Eire, La lengua colloquial de la comedia aristofánica, Murcia 1996, 211.
142 Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 263; cf. also Page ad E. Med. 339.
In general, editors are wary of accepting δαί in tragedy unless they feel its colloquial tone is warranted by the situation; a characteristic example is Jebb (on S. Ant. 318, App. p. 250): ‘Each passage in which the mss. ascribe δαί to [Euripides] should be tested by our sense of the degree in which, there, he meant to reproduce the language of every-day life.’ However, Stevens (supra, n. 141) 45 has rightly cast doubt on ‘the validity of this very subjective criterion, and of the assumption that E.[uripides]’s use of colloquialisms was entirely regulated by some single principle.’

38. Rh. 527-30

τίνος ἁ φυλακά; τίς ἀμείβει τὰν ἐμάν; πρῶτα
dύεται σημεία καὶ ἑπτάποροι
Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι 530

‘Whose turn is it to do guard duty? Who is to relieve my shift? The first signs are setting, and the Pleiades are aloft along their sevenfold paths in the heavens.’

In the wake of Lachmann144 and others, C. W. Willink145 emended πρῶτα into πρῶτας, sc. φυλακᾶς, arguing that ‘the transmitted brevis in longo at . . . πρῶτα || δύεται is extraordinary (in mid-phrase).’ I fail to see anything extraordinary here: for brevis in longo (and subsequent period-end) ‘in mid-phrase’ cf. e.g. E. Med. 427 (~ 415). Aside from this, how can the chorus say that the stars corresponding to ‘the first watch’ (Willink’s πρῶτας [sc. φυλακᾶς] σημεία) are setting only now? That the ‘first watch’ of the night has long been over is shown by Rh. 538–41: in fact, the Trojans’ is the fourth watch, cf. 5 τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φυλακήν146.

39. Rh. 546-50

Σιμόεντος ἡμένα κοίτας
φωινίας ύμνει πολυχορδότατα
γῆρις παιδολέτωρ
μελοποιῶν ἀποδόν μέριμναν. 550
548 φωινίας Ο: φον-VLQ θρηνεῖ ἵναυ -χορδόταταν Ω? (~Οκ?) 550
μελοποιῶν ... μέριμναν Dindorf (μέριμναν iam Reiske): -δς ... μέριμνα
fere Ω (μελω- ... μερίμνοι Q)

143 See Garvie ad l., who opts in the end for Auratus’ δή.
144 Cf. Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) 196.
145 See CQ 21, 1971, 351 n. 4; cf. more explicitly Willink, “Cantica” (supra, n. 9) 39 = Collected Papers 577-8.
146 Cf. also Vater, l.c. (supra, n. 144).
‘Sitting at the bloodied river-bank of the Simois, the nightingale, slayer of her own son, with its many-toned voice puts into song its music-making cares.’

In 547, the mss. are virtually unanimous in transmitting ὑμνεῖ. However, the scholia ad l. give θρηνεῖ as a (very tempting) γρ- variant. The dilemma is a difficult one, and more complicated than the universal acceptance of ὑμνεῖ by modern editors may suggest. Both ὑμνεῖ and θρηνεῖ can govern μελοποιῶν μέριμναν; for θρηνῶ with internal accusative cf. A. fr. 291 Radt θρηνεῖ δὲ γόον τὸν (τιν’?) ἀηδόνιον. The nightingale’s plaintive song can be thought of both as ὕμνος and as θρῆνος, cf. Ar. Av. 210-11 ὑμνοῦν, οὐκ … θρηνεῖς; for ὑμνεῖν θρήνοις cf. Rh. 976. Moreover, ὑμνεῖ with an object meaning ‘song’ is straightforward, θρηνεῖ less so, and thus the former might in principle be a banalization. On balance, however, ὑμνεῖ seems safer: θρηνεῖ may have been introduced by someone who took the verb’s object to be κοίτας φοινίας, so that in effect = ‘lamenting her bloodied wedding’; thus e.g. the scholiast ad l. (ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Σιμόεντος ἑζομένη θρηνεῖ τὰς φοινίας κοίτας)148, and Vater (luget cruentas nuptias luscinia)149.

As for μελοποιῶν … μέριμναν, Dindorf’s emendation of the mss. μελοποιοῖς … μέριμνα ορ μερίμνα150 (μέριμνα had already been proposed by Reiske151) is virtually unassailable. With μέριμνα one would have to take ἀηδονίς as an adjective152, an unparalleled usage. The slip from accusative to nominative would have been an easy one after the three nominatives ἡμένα, παιδολέτωρ, ἀηδονίς153.

40. Rh. 552-3

νυκτιβρόμου
σύριγγος ἰὰν κατακούω.
νυκτιβρόμου Pierson : νυκτιβρόμου OV: νυκτὶ δρ- LQ

‘I hear the sound of a pipe played by night.’

Defending the lectio tradita as against Pierson’s commonly accepted emendation, Pace154 argues that νυκτιβρόμου σύριγγος ἰὰν, supposedly an

---

147 See E. Schwartz, Scholia in Euripidem, Berlin 1891, 2, 341.21.
148 See Schwartz, Scholia (supra, n. 147) 341.22.
149 Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 532.
150 Dindorf, Euripidis tragicorum (supra, n. 15) ad 550.
151 Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 89. For earlier attempts to emend see Wecklein, SBAW München (supra, n. 72) 495-6.
152 Cf. Hermann, Opuscula (supra, n. 60) 306.
153 Thus Porter, Rhesus (supra, n. 111) ad l.
154 “Note” (supra, n. 22) 458-9.
enallage for νυκτιδρόμον s. i., can mean ‘the flute’s sound that runs (=spreads) through the night.’ However, in Greek sound can ‘travel’ (ἐλένω)\textsuperscript{155} or ‘come out’ (ἐξβαίνειν)\textsuperscript{156}, but it never seems to ‘run’. For the confusion BPOM / ΔPOM cf. E. Herc. 1212 δρόμον Reiske : βρόμον L.

41. Rh. 560-1

— ὀλλ' ἦ κρυπτὸν λόχον ἐσπαίσας
διόλωλε; ἵτ' ἄν εἰη† φοβερόν μοι.
560 εἰσπαίσας Ο: εἰσπεσών VaLQ

‘Could it be that he chanced on a hidden ambush and perished? This is what I fear.’

The unmetrical εἰσπεσών (VaLQ) in 560 may have started life as an interlinear gloss. This seems to be confirmed by the reading of O in 559 (ἀπεστίν ἐμπεσών), where the uncalled-for ἐμπεσών (from an original ἐσπεσών?) apparently intruded from the interlinear space below. While ἐσπαίσας is doubtless correct, it is ironically less accurate than εἰσπεσών: εἰσπαίειν means ‘to burst in’ (cf. S. OT 1252), εἰσπίπτειν ‘to fall in’ (by chance), and it is the latter sense that we need here. In E. Or. 1315, Wecklein’s στείχει γὰρ εἰσπαίσουσα (εἰσπεσοῦσα mss.) δικτύων βρόχους is based on the present passage, and thus offers no warranty for the validity of εἰσπαίειν here — the more so since Or. 1315-16 are probably interpolated (Willink ad l.), and at any rate εἰσπαίειν ‘is an unnaturally violent’ verb in that context (Willink \textit{l.c.}, though I cannot accept his view that ‘the notion of “striking” is much more to the point in Rh. 560’).

Line 561 presents a much more difficult problem. Among the emendations proposed I single out Morstadt’s (διόλωλε;) τάδ’ ἄν φοβερ’ εἰη\textsuperscript{157}, Hermann’s τάχ’ ἄν δ’ εἰή φανερόν {μοι}\textsuperscript{158}, and Herwerden’s (διόλωλε) τάλας; φοβερόν μοι\textsuperscript{159}. Taking his cue from Hermann, Diggle proposed a neat rewriting:

τάχ’ ἄν δ’ εἰή <φανερόν.
— καὶ μὴν τὸδ’ \textit{γ’} ἦν> φοβερόν μοι.

<Choreut A> ‘it should soon become apparent’ (\textit{viz.}, whether Dolon has met with foul play).

<Choreut B> ‘Well, this is exactly\textsuperscript{160} what I’ve been fearing’.

\textsuperscript{155} Cf. A. Sept. 964; S. Tr. 208; E. Supp. 89, El. 879.
\textsuperscript{156} S. Aj. 892.
\textsuperscript{157} Morstadt, (\textit{supra}, n. 40) 23.
\textsuperscript{158} Hermann, \textit{Opuscula} (\textit{supra}, n. 60) 306.
\textsuperscript{159} Herwerden, “Novae commentationes” (\textit{supra}, n. 114) 85.
\textsuperscript{160} On καὶ μὴν … \textit{γ’} see Denniston, \textit{Particles} (\textit{supra}, n. 54) 353-5.
Omission of <φανερόν ... ἦν> would be due to an error ex homoeoteleuto (φανερόν—φοβερόν). However, the sole parallel for the change of speaker at the beginning of a paroemiac seems to be S. Tr. 977. More radical, though pleasantly concise, is Headlam’s τάχ’ ἂν [ἐίθ φοβερόν μου]162: ‘Do you think Dolon may have been ambushed?’ — ‘No doubt’ (the excised words were presumably added to ‘complete’ the syntax, which was wrongly felt to be incomplete). For elliptical τάχ’ ἂν in replies Feickert163 ad 561 compares Pl. Soph. 255c, Resp. 369a. True, there seem to be no tragic examples of elliptic τάχ’ ἂν used in responses. Still, S. OC 964-5 θεοὶς γὰρ ἦν οὕτω φίλον, τάχ’ ἂν τι μηνίουσιν εἰς γένος πάλαι shows that τάχ’ ἂν can be used elliptically as a virtual synonym of ‘perhaps’: see Jebb ad l. and App. 283-6 for detailed discussion. In the end, Headlam’s solution seems to be preferable, qua more economical.

42. Rh. 567-8

οὐκ, ἓλα δεσμὰ πωλικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγουν
κλακείς σιδήρου
568 σιδήρου Bothe (denuo Paley): σιδήρου Ω

‘No, it is rather reins striking on chariot rails that produce a metallic noise.’

Bothe’s emendation164 introduces a bold cognate accusative (governed by κλακείς), for which cf. A. Sept. 386 κλάζουσι ... φόβον. Porter, Rhesus (supra, n.111) ad l. further compares Sept. 123 κινύρονται φόνον χαλινοί (see Hutchinson ad l.).

There is little to be said for the mss. reading, retained by Zanetto and Jouan. It would entail one of the following three interpretations:

(1) take κλακείς σιδήρου as a brachylogy for κλ- κλαγγὴν σιδήρου, ‘they emit an iron sound’ (with σιδήρου as genitive of quality); but I can find no satisfactory parallel for such a brachylogy;

(2) take κλακείς σιδήρου as the auditory equivalent of e.g. τρυγὸς ὄζειν, μύρου πνεῖν etc.;165 but this again would be unparalleled;

(3) take δεσμὰ σιδήρου as = δεσμὰ σιδηρᾶ (i.e. with σιδήρου as genitive of material);166 this would go perversely against the run of the sentence.

161 See Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 292.
163 Rhesus (supra, n. 92) ad 561.
165 Cf. Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 551; P. Albert, De Rheso tragœdia, diss., Halle 1876, 37, Dindorf, Euripidis tragœdiae (supra, n. 15) ad 568 paraphrases Aeris sonum reddit. For the construction see Kühner–Gerth (supra, n.22) 1, 356-7.
166 A solution put forth by Feickert, Rhesus (supra, n. 92) ad 568 but attributed by Vater l.c. (supra, n. 165) to Bothe (I have been unable to confirm this). Jouan, Euripide (supra, n.
43. Rh. 585-6

οὐκ οὖν ἐπ' Ἀινέαν ἢ τὸν ἐχθιστὸν Φρυγῶν
Πάριν μολόντε χρή καρατομεῖν ἔσει;
586 χρή Ov: χρῆν LQ

’Why, shouldn’t we attack Aeneas or Paris then, that most hateful of Trojans, and hack their heads off with a sword?’

Should we read χρῆ or χρή in 586? A difficult choice. The imperfect of χρή is used to express the idea that something ought to be the case but is not. Thus, χρῆν here would rather appositely suggest Diomedes’ reluctance in the face of Odysseus’ decision not to kill any more Trojans: ‘but still, should we not be (now in the process of) going and cutting off Aeneas’ and Paris’ heads (as we are not at this moment)?’. On the other hand, χρή makes Diomedes a little more unrelenting, since he insists that a prominent Trojan must be slain at all costs; besides, ‘shouldn’t we go and cut off Aeneas and Paris’ heads’ is a more straightforward proposition.

44. Rh. 607

ἐσται γὰρ αὐτῷ θάνατος ἐξ ἄλλης χερὸς,
ἐσται OŁQ: ἦκει Va: ἦξει Va

’For death will come to him from another man’s hand.’

Va’s ἦξει (in a supralinear note by the codex’s first scribe) deserves greater attention. For death ‘coming’ to humans cf. e.g. E. Alc. 671 ἢν δ’ ἐγγὺς ἔλθῃ θάνατος; Hipp. 1373 καὶ μοι θάνατος … ἔλθοι; Troad. 1167 θάνατος ἦλθε. Admittedly, however, I cannot find any instances in which ἦκω (rather than ἔρχομαι) is used of the coming of death.

45. Rh. 613-15

ὁδ’ ἐγγὺς ἦσται καὶ συνήθροισται στρατῷ,
ἀλλ’ ἐκτὸς αὐτὸν τάξεων κατηύνασεν
’Εκτὼρ, ἔσον ἀν νύκτ’ ὀμηφηταί φάοι.
615 νῦκτ’ Lenting: νυξ mss.

’He (sc. Rhesus) is encamped nearby and has not joined the (rest of the) army; rather, Hector stationed him apart from the ranks until the coming daybreak.’

29) 35 adopts it in his translation: ‘ce sont les chaînes de fer des attelages qui grincent.’
Lenting’s emendation is indispensable, for otherwise (with φῶς in the accusative) the sense would be exactly the opposite: ‘until daylight is succeeded by night.’ Paley’s (Euripides, suprā, n. 136) idea that νυξ ἀμείψηται φῶς is acceptable Greek for ‘shall have taken light in exchange for itself’, i.e. ‘shall have given place to day’ is untenable: ἀμείβομαι ‘get in exchange for’ requires a genitive (or ἀντί + genitive) indicating the thing exchanged, as well as an accusative indicating the thing got in exchange, e.g. S. Tr. 736-7 ἡ λύσους φρένας | τῶν νῦν παρουσῶν τῶνδ᾿ ἀμείψασθαι ποθεν.

46. Rh. 635

tοῦτον δὲ πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν.
χειρὸς οὖθεμὶς fere OV (θέμὶς post θανεῖνΟ): οὐ θερὸς LQ θανεῖν O et aut L1m aut Trm: κτανεῖνVLQ

‘For it is forbidden that this one (=Alexander) should die at your hands.’

χειρὸς οὖθεμὶς θανεῖν as such is found in no single ms. O has χειρὸς οὖθεμὶς θανεῖν, in keeping with its characteristic penchant for the uitium Byzantinum (cf. e.g. Rh. 170, 218, 220, 426, 433, 503, 506, 606, 618, 635, 636). V has χειρὸς οὖθεμὶς κτανεῖν; a marginal note in L (either by the first scribe or by Triclinius) has οὖθεμὶς χειρὸς θανεῖν, whereas Q and L post corr. have οὐθεμὶς θανεῖν. While there can be no doubt that κτανεῖν (which is incompatible with πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς) is a mere corruption of θανεῖν, it is hard to decide on the right word order: πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις or πρὸς σῆς οὐ θέμις χειρὸς; Pace Diggle, I should be inclined to opt for the latter: it is lectio difficilior because of the separation of noun and possessive, for which cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 6.368 ἡδη μ’ ὑπὸ χερσὶ δαμόωσιν Ἀχαιῶν; S. El. 1033 μητρὶ ταῦτα πάντ’ ἔξειπε σῇ; Kühner–Gerth (supra, n. 22) 2, 600.

47. Rh. 636-7

ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἡκεὶς μορσίμους φέρων σφαγὸς τάγμαν:
636 ὥσπερ P: ὥσπερ Ω

‘But make haste towards (the man) for whom you have arrived bringing fated slaughter.’

167 For the corruption cf. E. IT 553 θανόν Tr2: κτανόν <L>P. For the inverse error cf. IT 484 κτανεῖν Seidler: θανεῖν L et Stob. 3.8.6.
While the majority reading ὥσπερ ἥκεις obviously makes little sense, ὥσπερ ἥκ- is not entirely accurate: the man whom Diomedes has ‘come’ (ἡκεῖς) to kill is not Rhesus, but Hector (575–6 ἐρ’ ὥσπερ). Adding to the confusion, the place to which Diomedes ‘has come’ (ἡκεῖς), i.e. the Trojan camp, is not the same as the place to which he is enjoined to ‘hasten’ (τάχυν’), i.e. the ‘separate’ (cf. 520 διὰ) space assigned Rhesus for the night. It would be unlikely for Athena, of all characters, to be misrepresenting the facts, since it is thanks to her intervention (595–607) that the Greeks turned their murderous attentions, midway, from the unreachable Hector to the more vulnerable Rhesus. Kovacs' οἷπερ ἥξεις (‘but hasten whither you will arrive bringing fated slaughter’) does remove the inaccuracy, but only at the expense of introducing a redundancy: in Athena’s mouth, τάχυνε, ‘make haste’, surely implies that Diomedes will ‘arrive’, ἥξεις. Moreover, as Mastronarde has pointed out, ᾧπερ here is supported by the antithesis with τοῦτον in the previous line (‘not Alexander but Rhesus’).

I suggest: ἀλλ’ ᾧ προσήκει μορσίμους φέρων σφαγὰ | τάχυν’, ‘but make haste as you bring fated slaughter to the man it beseems’ (sc. to bring slaughter)171. This is precisely the point one should expect Athena to make: since fate will not allow Diomedes to slay Alexander (635), Diomedes should rather ‘bring slaughter’ to a target whose death is not forbidden by fate (cf. μορσίμους), and may therefore be described as ‘befitting’ or ‘suitable’.

48. Rh. 640-1

καὶ ταῦτ’ ἐχω μὲν εἰπον· ὅν δὲ χρὴ παθεῖν
οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδ’ ἤκουσεν ἐγγὺς ὢν λόγου.

‘And although I have said these words, he (=Alexander) does not know nor has he heard who is the man who must suffer, though he be within earshot of my speech.’

168 Euripidea Tertia (supra, n. 11) 148-9.
169 Kovacs (per litteras) points out to me that the emphasis in the relative clause falls, as is often the case, not on the verb of motion (ἡκεῖς) but on the participle dependent on it (φέρων)’, cf. Goodwin, Syntax (supra, n. 34) § 895 so that the whole means ‘But make haste to the man to whom your coming will bring fated slaughter.’ This is true, but the (characteristically Euripidean) idiom ἥκω + participle is usually reserved for situations in which a character explains the purpose for which he has come or the circumstances in which he has come; cf. E. Or. 245-6, 688, 854, 1323, 1628; A. Th. 40, Ag. 258; S. Ant. 394–5, El. 666; Bond on E. Hyps. fr. 60.39 (p. 110); T. B. L. Webster, CR 47, 1933, 117–23, here 118. In other words, the idea of a person’s arrival remains central in such expressions, even though the leading idea is conveyed by the participle.
170 Mastronarde, in Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 21-2.
171 The corruption from ωπροσ- to ωπερ may have been facilitated by the similarity between the minuscule abbreviations for προς and for ερ.
Schmidt’s Ταῦτα σοί μέν for the mss. Ταῦτ’ ἐγὼ μέν is worth considering: ἐγὼ μέν εἶπον, with its emphatically placed first-person pronoun, implies a false antithesis between Athena and another speaking person. But the true antithesis is between Diomedes, to whom Athena has been speaking, and Alexander, who is prevented from hearing what Athena has just said. For ταῦτα σοί μέν εἶπον Schmidt compares E. El. 1276 σοί μέν τάδ’ εἶπον (‘you contrasted to the ensuing ‘the citizens’), Supp. 1213 σοί μέν τάδ’ εἶπον (as opposed to παίσι δ’ Ἀργείων λέγω), Hel. 1662 σοί μέν τάδ’ αὐδῶ (followed by συγγόνῳ δ’ ἐμῇ λέγω), Ph. 568 (an address to Eteocles concluded by σοί μέν τάδ’ αὐδῶ and followed by an address to Polynices, σοί δέ, Πολύνεικες, λέγω)173.

It is true that in all of Schmidt’s examples σοί is placed at the beginning of the sentence, in emphatic position. This, however, is no argument against his emendation. Initial σοί in the passages invoked by Schmidt brings into focus the antithesis between the preceding portion of the speaker’s utterance, which was addressed to σοί, and the following portion, which is addressed to someone else. In the present passage, by contrast, the antithesis is not between two different addressees but rather between a character (σοί μέν, ‘you, Diomedes’) who can hear the speaker and another character who cannot. Foregrounding ταῦτ’ makes it clear that this antithesis is due to a calculated disparity between those aware of Athena’s plan (ταῦτ’, summarizing 636-9) and those still in the dark.

49. Rh. 686

(Xo.) ἦ σὺ δὴ ῾Ρῆσον κατέκτας; (Od.) <μὴ> ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ (ante ἦ) nullam notam O: ἠμιχ. VLQ (ante ἀλλὰ) ’Od. οm. VLQ <μή> Dindorf; cf. A. Ch. 918, Denniston, GP 4-5 κτενοῦντα LV: κταν- OQ

‘(Chorus) So, was it you who killed Rhesus? (Odysseus) No; (I rather killed) the man who was going to kill you.’

The line seems irremediably absurd. The first hemistich may be spoken either by the chorus (thus VLQ) or by Odysseus174 — in the latter case, presumably


174 Thus Kovacs, Euripides (supra, n. 16) 422, supported by Mastronarde, in Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 22. It has been argued by L. Battezzato (“Parola d’ordine e distribuzione delle battute in [Euripide], Reso 682-89”, Lexis 22, 2004, 277-88, here 277-9, 280-4) that both Odysseus and Diomedes are in the orchestra, and that the first half of 686 is addressed by the chorus to Diomedes, while the second half is spoken by Odysseus, who quickly chimes in to prevent a mindless response by Diomedes. For arguments against the notion that Dio-
as a red herring to distract the Trojan guards. Either way, one fails to see why Rhesus’ murder should be mentioned at all: the chorus have not yet been apprized of it, while Odysseus has no interest in revealing the fact.\(^{175}\) The same objection goes for Morstadt’s otherwise interesting suggestion that κατέκτας refers to murderers intent rather than to actual murder (cf. S. Aj. 1126 with Jebb \textit{ad l.}; E. \textit{Ion} 1500)\(^{176}\). As for the second hemistich, it makes little sense, however one looks at it. If spoken by the chorus, it must mean something like ‘No, but (i rather killed) yourself (σέ) who meant to kill \textit{him} (τὸν κτενοῦντα).’ But how can the chorus surmise that Odysseus intended to kill Rhesus? If the second half-line is spoken by Odysseus (thus presumably \textit{O}), his red herring is bound to prove ineffective, since he will be unable to produce the body of the mysterious potential murderer he claims to have slain. All in all, the line is best deleted, just like 685 (cf. Diggle \textit{in app. crit.}).

Here are some representative attempts that have been made to extract some sense out of 686.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Badham, followed by Schenkl and Paley, transposes 685/6 and introduces concomitant emendations\(^{177}\): |686 Ὀδ. ή σὺ δῇ Ῥῆσον κατέκτας; Χο. ἄλλα τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ |685 ἱστορῶ. Ὀδ. θάρσει, πέλας ἴθι. Χο. παίε, παίε, παίε πάς. But this still leaves us with the unwanted mention of Rhesus, and ἄλλα τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ ἱστορῶ is impossible Greek for ‘nay, I am asking you about the person who came to kill \textit{us}’ (a point half-conceded by Paley). Moreover, one fails to see the connection of Odysseus’ θάρσει, πέλας ἴθι with what precedes it.
  \item Wilamowitz\(^{178}\) suggested recombining 680 and 685 into a trochaic verse (Χο. δεῦρο δεῦρο πάς ἴτω [ἵστοι mss.] Ὀδ. θάρσει. Χο. πέλας ἴθι παίε πάς), to be placed after 679. But the resulting trochaic tetrameter would lack, as Wilamowitz was aware, the requisite caesura after the second metron; presumed exceptions to this rule, namely A. Pers. 165 and S. \textit{Phil.} 1402, are probably to be emended or deleted\(^{179}\), and at any rate they are too
\end{enumerate}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{175} This was already seen by S. Petit, \textit{Miscellaneorum libri novem}, Paris 1630, 3, 196; cf. also L. C. Valckenaer, \textit{Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias}, Leiden 1767, 108-9; Morstadt, \textit{Beitrag (supra, n. 40)} 36-7; H. Grégoire, in \textit{Mélanges offerts à M. Octave Navarre}, Toulouse 1935, 232-3; Ritchie, \textit{Authenticity (supra n. 8)} 73-4; Battezzato, “Parola” \textit{(supra, n. 174)} 281.

\textsuperscript{176} Morstadt, \textit{Beitrag (supra, n. 40)} 37. For other, less likely explanations see e.g. Badham, “Miscellanea” \textit{(supra, n. 13)} 337; D. Ebener (ed.), \textit{Rhesos: Tragödie eines unbekannten Dichters}, Berlin 1966, 17.

\textsuperscript{177} See Badham, “Miscellanea” \textit{(supra, n. 13)} 337; K. Schenkl, “Die Euripideische literatur von 1850-1862”, \textit{Philologus} 20, 1863, 485; Paley, \textit{Euripides (supra, n. 135)} ad 686.


\textsuperscript{179} Cf. West, \textit{Greek Metre (supra, n. 130)} 91; Garvie on A. Pers. 165.
few and far between to warrant Wilamowitz’s solution. Moreover, θάρσει is hardly the response one should expect of a cornered Odysseus; significantly, Wilamowitz found himself obliged to pretend that θάρσει can mean, in effect, ‘easy now’ (‘nur ruhig’).

(3) H. Grégoire, emended 686 into (Ὀδ.) μή σὺ δείρης ὃν κατέκτας, ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σε, ‘don’t cudgel someone you’ve already killed, go rather for the one who is about to kill you.’ The emendation makes for oddly contorted Greek, not least because it uses κατακτέινειν in both its figurative and its literal senses in the space of a single line.

(4) In the wake of a number of earlier scholars, Ritchie advanced a preposterous hypothesis: (i) Odysseus, who has despoiled Rhesus, enters clad in the latter’s armour; (ii) he is subsequently ‘struck down by one of the blows accompanying the παῖε πᾶς of 685’; (iii) members of the chorus realize that the man they attacked bears the arms of Rhesus; the suspicion is formulated in the first half-line of 686, which is spoken by some of the choreuts: ‘have you killed Rhesus?’; to which the rest of the choreuts reply (second half-line of 686) ‘no, I only killed someone who was going to kill you.’ At this juncture, Ritchie argues, Odysseus comes to and decides to play along by pretending that he actually is Rhesus; whereby he eventually manages to escape. This interpretation cannot hold water. Ritchie’s point (i) is untenable since Odysseus cannot be allowed any accoutrements (such as Rhesus’ armour) that might give him away; his point (ii) is weakened by the distinct possibility that 685 is extremely hard to make sense of, and perhaps interpolated; as for his point (iii), it falls together with point (i). Most importantly, the chorus are too familiar with Rhesus’ outward aspect (they had nearly 150 lines in which to observe him, 380-526) to be fooled so easily by Odysseus’ imposture. And if they did somehow take Odysseus to be Rhesus, they would surely not have made a point of asking him—the formidable leader of an allied army!— for the night’s password (688), which they know has already been given him by Hector (521).

180 (supra, n. 175) 233-6.

181 e.g. S. Musgrave, Εὐριπίδου τὰ σῳζόμενα: Euripidis quae extant omnia, Oxford 1778, 2, 410 (on Rh. 688); Beck, Exercitatio (supra, n. 81) 11-12; Morstadt, Beitrag (supra, n. 40) 32.

182 Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 73-4; for the absurdity cf. J. A. Hartung, Euripides restitutus sive scriptorum Euripidis ingenii censura, Hamburg 1843, 1, 32 n.**; C. B. Sneller, De Rheso tragedia, diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam 1949, 21. Battezzato, “Parola” (supra, n. 174) 279-80 thinks that the author of Rh. follows here the Doloneia, where the two Greeks have no time to remove Rhesus’ armour.

183 Cf. Hartung l.c. (supra, n. 182): ‘Non potuit se Ulysses Rhesum esse fingere, quia statim fraudis convinceretur ab ipsis, qui paullo ante Rhesum ipsum praesentem oculos suis intuiri erant.’
50. Rh. 687

("Od.) ἵσχε πᾶς τις. Xo. οὐ μὲν οὖν. 'Od. ἄ· φίλιον ἄνδρα μὴ θένης. μὲν οὖν Reiske: μενοῦ O\textsuperscript{184}: μενῶ VLQ

'(Odysseus) Desist, everyone! (Chorus) Most certainly not! (Odysseus) Hey! Don’t strike a man who’s your friend!

For οὐ μὲν οὖν (‘neutiquam’) see Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 90. The VLQ reading would have to mean ‘I will not tarry’, i.e. ‘I will strike without further ado’; but μένω in this sense signifies ‘to wait until X happens’ or ‘to be left behind’ (cf. LSJ s.v. μένω, I.3). Pace adduces a number of tragic passages that purportedly support οὐ μενῶ = ‘I will not linger’ (E. Med. 389, El. 220, 226, Hel. 548, Phoen. 897, IA 855)\textsuperscript{185}. However, aside from the impossible hiatus thus created\textsuperscript{186}, in all of these passages μένειν means ‘to stay, to refrain from departing’, a sense obviously inapposite here. It would be just possible to interpret ‘I will not tolerate this’, but this is unlikely with μενῶ tout court: a complement would be required (cf. e.g. E. Phoen. 740 ἀπορίαν γὰρ οὐ μενῶ)\textsuperscript{187}.

51. Rh. 703

ποίον ἐπεύχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;
ἐπεύχεται Hermann: εὖχ- Ω: δ’ εὖχ- Porson, Bothe

‘Which of the gods does he proclaim to be supreme?’

For ἐπεύχεται see Hermann, Opuscula (supra, n. 60) 307. ποίον δ’ εὖχεται was simultaneously hit upon by Porson and Bothe\textsuperscript{188}. Sticking to the lectio tradita, Pace\textsuperscript{189} takes ποίον εὔχεται as hypodochmiac (―Θ――Θ―) in Responsionsfreiheit with πρίν ἐπὶ γὰρ Φρυγῖν in 721 (―Θ――Θ――Θ――Θ――Θ―). But aside from the dubiety of the whole concept of Responsionsfreiheit (see item 7 above), Pace’s alleged parallel, namely IA 235 = 246, comes from a probably interpolated portion and is a special case involving a proper name (Καπανέως) in 246.

\textsuperscript{184} Pace, “Note” (supra, n. 22) 460 n. 29 claims that O reads οὐ μενῶ, like VLQ, but Diggle (per litteras) informs me that O’s reading is as reported in his app. crit.

\textsuperscript{185} See Pace, “Note” (supra, n. 22) 460.

\textsuperscript{186} Pace imagines the hiatus is rendered tolerable by the antilabe and the exclamation, but Battezzato, “Parola” (supra, n. 17 4) 284–7 shows that this is simply untrue.

\textsuperscript{187} On the semantic inappropriateness of μενῶ here see also Battezzato, “Parola” (n. 174) 287.

\textsuperscript{188} Bothe, Euripides’ Werke (supra, n. 164) 297. I was unable to trace Porson’s conjecture.

\textsuperscript{189} Pace, Reso (supra, n. 36) 53.
52. Rh. 708

—τίν’ ἀλκὴν τίν’ αἰνεῖς; —Ὀδυσσῆ
tίν’ ἀλ- OV : τίς ἀλ- LQ

‘(One choreut) Whose bravery are you praising? (Another choreut) Odysseus’ own’.

In the LQ, τίς must be meant a self-standing question taking up θρασύς in 707: τίς; ἀλκὴν τίν’ αἰνεῖς; ‘Who (sc. is it that you call θρασύς)?’ However, bacchiacs here and in 706-7, 724-6 are separated from each other by diaeresis, so as to form syntactically self-contained units; the effect is surely too striking to be fortuitous, and one ought not to disturb the balance.

53. Rh. 710-14

ἔβα καὶ πάρος 710
κατά πόλιν ὕπαφρον ὀμμ’ ἔχων,
ῥακοδύτῳ στολᾷ πυκασθείς,
κρύφιος ἐν πέπλοις.
κρύφιος Bothe, denuo Morstadt: κρυφαῖος Ω

‘In the past, too, he (sc. Odysseus) went into the city (of Troy), his face under cover, a ragged outfit around his body, a sword hidden inside his cloak’.

κρύφιος was first proposed by F. H. Bothe190, then again independently by Morstadt191, thus restoring responson with 696. Pace’s defence of mss. κρυφαῖος192 rests on the doubtful assumption193 that τίνὶ π’ ῥοσεικάσω is possible in 696194. Even if lengthening before mute + liquid is admitted in a few cases in tragic lyric, this is no reason to accept it where it can be disposed of by so simple an emendation as κρυφαῖος > κρύφιος.

191 Morstadt, Beitrag (supra, n. 40) 41.
192 Pace, Reso (supra, n. 36) 52-3.
193 The assumption is endorsed by Delle Donne, “In margine” (supra, n. 39) 203.
194 See Barrett on E. Hipp. 760 and Addenda (p. 435) with due warnings (although he does not exclude the possibility); Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 344, 386.
54. Rh. 764-7

... οὐδ' ἐφρουρεῖτο στρατός
φυλακαῖσι νυκτέροισιν οὐδ' ἐν τάξεσιν
ἐκεῖτο τεύχη πλήκτρα τ' οὐκ ἐπὶ ζυγοῖς
ἵππων καθήρμοσθ', ...

‘nor was the army guarded by night sentinels, nor were there any
arms lying with the ranks(?), nor were goads fitted on the horses’
yokes’.

οὐδ' ἐν τάξεις | ἐκεῖτο τεύχη raises an elementary question: where were
the Thracian arms if not with their owners? It is inconceivable that the
Thracians left their arms anywhere else except ‘in their ranks’, i.e. where
the rank and file slept. When the charioteer wakes up, he finds himself ‘without
a spear at hand’ but can clearly see, and reach for, his weapon (792-3), which
presumably lay somewhere beside him. This is the case also in II. 10.471-3
εὐδον ... ἐντεα δὲ φιν | καλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖσι χθονὶ κέκλιτο εὐκ κατὰ κόσμον
| τριστοιχε; and even in the drunken disarray of the Rutulian sleepers in
Verg. A. 9.318-19, the weapons lie close to hand, albeit mixed up with wine-
cups. It is, on the other hand, entirely conceivable (if militarily unadvisable)
that the Thracians would have taken their armour off before going to bed, a
sense easily obtained by a simple transposition: οὐδ' ἐν τεύχεσιν | ἐκεῖντο
τάξεις, ‘nor did the ranks lie [=sleep] in their armour’ — as the Trojans, we
recall, more prudently did (cf. 21-2). For the construction cf. Th. 2.61.2 καὶ
tινα μίαν νύκτα καὶ κατέδαρθον ἐν Θησείῳ τῷ ἐν πόλει ἐν ὀπλοῖς.

55. Rh. 770-2

καγὼ μελούση καρδία λήξες ὑπνου
πώλοισι χόρτον, προσδοκῶν ἑωθινὴν
ζεὔξειν ἐς ἀλκήν, ἀφθόνω μετρῶ χερί.
ἐς ἀλκήν V : πρὸς ἀλκήν LQ

‘And I, abandoning my sleep with anxious heart, measure out fodder
to the steeds with unstinting hand, expecting to yoke them for an
early-morning confrontation.’

Both ἐς ἀλκήν and πρὸς ἀλκήν seem to be used interchangeably in E. Su.
678-9 ἔστρεφον | πώλους ἐς ἀλκήν and Andr. 1148-9 στρατόν | στρέφας
πρὸς ἀλκήν. For what it is worth, εἰς ἀ- is a much commoner tragic idiom195

195 Cf. also E. fr. 298.3, 754b.6 Kn., Med. 264, Hel. 42, 980, 1379, Ph. 421, 1363.
than πρὸς ἀ-196. Besides, the LQ reading may be the result of interference from προσδοκῶν in the previous line.

56. Rh. 785-6

... αἱ δ' ἔρρεγκον ἐξ ἀρτηρίων θυμὸν πνέουσαι κἀνεχαίτιζον φόβῳ.
786 φόβῳ Ω: φόβην Reiske

‘...while the horses snorted as they breathed their fury through their wind-pipes and threw their manes back in panic’.

Reiske’s φόβην197 was presumably suggested by the fact that ἀναχαιτίζω elsewhere seems to demand an accusative (cf. Sud. α2133); cf. Heliodor. 2.35.1 τὴν κόμην ... ἀναχαιτίζων; Philostr. Her. 31.1 ἀναχαιτίζων τὴν κόμην. Indeed, φόβην is good tragic idiom for ‘mane’, cf. E. Alc. 429 αὐχένων φόβην; A. Cho. 188; S. El. 449 βοστρύχων ... φόβας; OC 1465; fr. 707a.1 Radt; E. fr. 540.5 Kannicht. And φόβῳ here could be an error by anticipation of φόβος at 788. However, in S. fr. 179 ἀναχαιτίζω seems to be used intransitively, as it certainly is in Plut. Mor. 150a; Philostr. Im. 2.17.1; cf. Hippiatrica Cantabrigiensia 81.8198; Hsch. α4677, 4683 Latte. Moreover, horses rear up when afraid, and so φόβῳ is apposite.

57. Rh. 787-8

ἐγὼ δ' ἀμύνων θῆρας ἐξεγείρομαι πώλοισιν· ἔννυχος γὰρ ἐξώρμα φόβος.

‘As for me, i woke up fighting off the beasts from the horses; for the nocturnal fear urged me on.’

M. Platnauer199 pointed out that ἔξωρμα, when transitive, is always followed by an accusative, and went on to emend into ἔνν- δέ μ' ἔξωρμα φ-, with δέ = γάρ200. Although it is true that active ἔξωρμα is always followed by an accusatius objecti, it is also true that in no other extant case is the object so easy to supply mentally as in the present passage. The lectio tradita may stand, therefore, although Platnauer’s conjecture probably merits a place in an apparatus criticus.

196 Cf. E. Ph. 862; A. Sept. 498 with Hutchinson ad l.
197 Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 91.
199 Eranos 62, 1964, 73.
200 Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 169-70.
For σφαγῆς see Musgrave, *Euripidis* (n. 181) 411. Hermann\(^{201}\) read δεσπότου πάρα σφαγαῖς, presumably taking σφαγαῖς (locative dative) with αἵματος in 791, as in A. Ag. 1389 αἵματος σφαγήν, an odd phrase that is sometimes explained along the lines of ‘the blood gushing from the wound’ (LSJ s.v. σφαγή I.2)\(^{202}\). However, the *Agamemnon* passage is probably corrupt, at least as far as σφαγή is concerned (see Fraenkel ad l.), and at any rate it is hard to see how the alleged parallel might help make sense of the *Rhesus* passage. In their comment on the Ag. passage, Denniston and Page\(^{203}\) invoke, after Headlam, *Rh.* 790-1 as ‘an exact parallel’ but they can offer only a very clumsy rendering of it\(^{204}\), which merely goes to prove that the *Rh.* passage as transmitted is impossible to be made sense of. Aside from the inadequacy of the Aeschylean ‘parallel’, the postposition of πάρα not in end-line would be highly unusual in tragic iambics: see Denniston on E. *El.* 574.

Musgrave’s emendation (with σφαγῆς having its usual meaning of ‘wound’) simply and neatly indicates the source of the gushing blood. True, παρά with genitivus personae is much more common than it is with genitivus rei (hence Hermann’s emendation); but παρά + gen. rei to designate provenance is a recognized poetic usage, cf. Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 1, 509. The ancient scholia\(^{205}\) and later editors (e.g. Paley) read δεσπότου παρά σφαγαῖς, taking παρά + dative to indicate the charioteer’s proximity to his master when the latter was slaughtered. But this is not borne out by the Greek; besides, what we need to know is surely where the κρουνός came from, not where the charioteer was standing when it splashed him.

---

\(^{201}\) Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 308.

\(^{202}\) Cf. Meschini, in *Scritti* (*supra*, n. 42) 224–5.

\(^{203}\) J. D. Denniston & D. Page (eds.), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford 1957, *ad* 1387 [*sic*].

\(^{204}\) ‘A hot stream, issuing from my master, strikes me with woundings (or whatever σφαγαῖς does mean) of fresh blood, while he struggles against death.’

\(^{205}\) See Schwartz, *Scholia* (*supra*, n. 147) 342.8–9.
59. Rh. 811-12

κούτ᾽ εἰςιόντας στρατόπεδ᾽ ἐξαπώσατε
οὔτ᾽ ἐξιόντας;
811 ἐξαπώσατε Naber

‘And you thrust them away neither as they were entering nor as they were exiting the camp?’

ἐξαπώσατε is a hapax in the whole of Greek literature, and a problematic form: normal Attic would require ἐξαπεώσατε, which could only be accepted with synizesis (cf. Paley’s ἐξαπεώσατε); but synizesis in the fifth ‘foot’ of the iambic trimeter is to be avoided206. Ritchie207 evoked Soph. fr. 479.1 Radt as a possible parallel, but Herwerden’s ἐπαύσε (for Eustathius’ ἀπώσε) is now generally accepted there. It would be unadvisable to explain away the unaugmented form as a Homerism (thus Porter, Rhesus [supra, n. 111] | ad l.): such forms generally occur only in messenger speeches, and then ordinarily at line-opening position only. As far as I can see, there is only one intractable exception to this rule, namely E. Ba. 1134, where however γυμνοῦντο, although not at beginning of line, occurs at least in a messenger speech. Of the other apparent exceptions mentioned by Dodds on E. Ba. 1133–6, six are easily emended208, while one (A. Pers. 313) may be spurious209 or otherwise emendable (νοδεὺς ἐπεσον ἐκ μιᾶς Porson), and at any rate occurs in a messenger speech210. Mastronarde211 argues that, if Rh. is a fourth-century work, perhaps ἐξαπώσατε can stand for ἐξαπεώσατε; but there are no adequate parallels, either from the fourth or from any other century.

It is true that ἐξαπώσατε … ἐξιόντας, although not strictly an absurdity as Naber thought212, involves a rather harsh zeugma, e.g. οὔτ᾽ ἐξιόντας <εἴλετε> / <ἐζωγρήσατε>; in a translation it might be preferable to render by ‘you intercepted them’ or the like. However harsh, the zeugma (‘an effect of vehement utterance’, Mastronarde l.c., supra n. 211) is not much harsher than, say, S. El. 435–6 ἣ πνοάισιν ἢ βαθυσκαφεῖ κόνει | κρύφον νῦν, where one is to understand παράδος or the like with πνοάισιν (see Jebb ad l.)213.

206 See Descroix, Trimètre (supra, n. 33) 32–3.
207 Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 154, 178.
208 E. Andr. 1130 καφυλάσσετ’; Ion 1205 σιάξους ἠθάμβησεν; Alc. 839 ἐγείνατ’ Ἡλεκτρώνος; S. Ph. 371 κυρεῖ; OC 1506 τήρεϊ ἐθηκε.
209 Thus Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136); but see Broadhead’s supplementary notes on 311–13 and Garvie ad 310.
210 See further Davies on S. Tr. 560, 767, 904.
211 Mastronarde, in Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 22.
212 S. A. Naber, Mnemosyne n.s. 9, 1881, 5–6.
213 For other harsh zeugmata in tragedy, though none that is strictly comparable with this one, cf. Friis-Johansen and Whittle on A. Su. 1006–7, 681–3; Garvie on A. Ch. 360–2.
Naber (l.c., supra n. 212) proposed ἐξηπύσατε, which does away with the zeugma and is consistent with this author’s otherwise unparalleled use of ἀπύω in non-lyric contexts (cf. 776). But surely the guards would be expected to capture or drive away (ἐξαπώσατε) the foreign spies rather than merely raise a clamour (ἐξηπύσατε). As for J. I. Beare’s ἐξαπώσατε214, it is out of the question: ἐξορῶ means ‘to catch sight of from a distance, to descry’, which would be impossible in the darkness; what is more, the perfect tense seems to be unattested for this compound.

All in all, ἐξαπώσατε seems to give the right sense, but is a problematic form. No satisfactory emendation lies to hand, and a crux is recommended.

60. Rh. 821-3

†μέγας ἐμοὶ μέγας ὁ πολίοχον κράτος
tοτ’ ἄρ’ ἐμολον ὅτε σοι† ἄγγελος ἦλθον ἀμφὶ ναῦς πύρ’ αἴθειν.

‘†Great to me, o great city-guarding ruler, it was then that I came to you, when† I arrived to announce that fires were burning around the (Greek) ships’

In 821-2 the transmitted text is both ungrammatical and unmetrical; for a list and refutation of earlier attempts to emend see Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 309. For the address cf. E. Tr. 1216-7 ὦ μέγας ἐμοὶ ποτ’ ὦν | ἀνάκτωρ πόλεως215. At least the epanadiplosis μέγας … μέγας seems guaranteed by the correspondence with φίλα … φίλος at 455. Nauck’s216 μέγα σῦ μοι μέγ’ ὦ is neat and economical: μέγ’ ὦ could easily give way to the (false) scriptio plena μέγας ὦ, which in turn would retrospectively force μέγα σῦ μοι into accordance with the following μέγας, thereby giving rise to the transmitted μέγας ἐμοὶ. As for πολίοχον (Vater l.c., supra n. 215 : πολιοῦχον mss.), which restores the metre, it is supported by its earlier occurrence at 166. It is true that Πολίοχος seems to be attested elsewhere only as a proper name in Athens217; but despite Pace218 this is no argument against Vater’s correction.

A more difficult problem is presented by 822, which albeit metrical (a ‘hexasyllable’219) seems to yield no satisfactory sense. The transmitted text

214 Hermathena 13, 1905, 70-86, here 79.
215 Cited by Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 808.
217 Already in the 5th/4th century; see P. M. Fraser & E. Matthews, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Oxford 1994, 2, 370.
218 Pace, Reso (supra, n. 36) 57 with n. 93.
219 On the ‘hexasyllable’, a sequence related to the dochmiac, see Barrett on E. Hipp. 565-
can only mean: ‘surely it was then they came (sc. οἱ κατάσκοποι) when I went to bring thee news that fires were blazing round the ships’ (Porter, Rhesus [supra, n. 111] ad l.). But omission of the crucial οἱ κατάσκοποι seems very awkward, especially since ἔμολον is likely to be interpreted as first person singular in view of the following ἦλθον; moreover, as Willink points out, ἄρα ‘does not mean “surely”’.

An emendation worth considering is that proposed by Willink: μέγα σὲ μοι | μέγα σε πολίοχον | κράτος τότ’ ἄρ’ ἐμολον ὅτε σοι κτλ., ‘(it was) to you as a ruling power mighty in my eyes that I came on that occasion, when I came with the report that...’. As Willink explains, ‘the chorus know that they left their post only the once, for sufficiently exonerating reasons, and that they have not been otherwise remiss.’ But this would obscure the logical link with the following ἐπεί: having stated that they left their post only once, the chorus should then be expected to add ‘and I otherwise did not budge from my post’ or something of the sort, rather than point out that they never fell asleep on their duty.

An easy emendation would be τόδ’ ἄρα μέλον ἐτ’ ἐμοὶ | ἄγγελος ἦλθον κτλ. (in conjunction with Nauck’s emendation discussed in the previous paragraph): ‘it was still with that thing in mind that I came to announce’ etc. Here, τόδ’ would refer to the guard duty Hector accuses the chorus of having abandoned, and μέλον would be used as an accusative absolute, although its syntax is personal with τόδ’ as subject (cf. e.g. Pl. Protag. 314c δόξαν ήμιν ταῦτα ἐπορεύομαι; Aristoph. Vesp. 1287-8 ἐγέλων ... θεώμενοι, | οὖδ' ἄρ' ἐμοὶ μέλον)223. The primary item in the chorus’ defence would be, then, that they never for one moment forgot about their assigned task, even when they had temporarily to abandon their posts in order to communicate important news to Hector. The ἐπεί-sentence at 824ff. further elaborates on that thought: ‘my guard duty was always on my mind; for (ἐπεί) I didn’t get a wink of sleep this night’. For ἄρα ‘expressing a lively feeling of interest’ see Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 33-5 (but the usage admittedly has ‘a precarious footing in tragedy’).

600, p. 267-8; Dale, Lyric Metres (supra, n. 38) 115-16; Conomis, “Dochmiacs” (supra, n. 39) 28-30; Diggle, Studies (supra, n. 47) 19.

220 So also Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 309.
221 Willink, “Cantica” (supra, n. 9) 38 = Collected Papers 576.
222 “Cantica” (supra, n. 9) 34, 38 = Collected Papers 572-3, 577.
223 See Goodwin, Syntax (supra, n. 34) § 854: ‘The accusative absolute used personally without ὡς or ὡσπερ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with neuter participles which are regularly impersonal.’ See also Kühner–Gerth (supra, n.22) 2, 89-90; for μέλον as accusative absolute see LSJ s.v. μέλω, II.2.
61. Rh. 844-5

τίς ἂν ὑπερβαλὼν λόχους
Τρώουν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἤλθεν, ὡστε καὶ λαθεῖν;

844 ὄν Nauck: δ’ Ω, quo seruato 845 ἦλθ’ ἄν Beck (cf. Studies 100, 120)

‘Who could have reached us passing through the Trojan companies [that lay in-between] so that he might remain unnoticed?’

For Nauck’s emendation see his ‘Studien’ (supra, n. 20) 182-3. There can be no question that a ‘potential’ rather than a simple indicative (as in the mss. τίς δ’ ὑπερβαλὼν) is required here to express past possibility224. An alternative solution would be to keep the mss reading at 844 —with δ’ expressing indignation at the implicit suggestion contained in the question225— and to accept Beck’s ἦλθ’ ἄν at 845226. Against Beck’s emendation Paley (Euripides, supra, n. 136) ad 845 invoked Elmsley’s alleged ‘rule’ postulating that Attic poets avoid eliding 3rd-person -ε before ἄν227; but the validity of the ‘rule’ has been repeatedly assailed by Diggle228.

62. Rh. 847-8

τίς οὖν τέτρωται, τίς τέθνηκε †συμμάχων†
τῶν σῶν, μολόντων ὃς σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις;

848 ὄν Bothe: ως Ω

‘Who has been wounded, then, among your allies? Who has died, if as you claim it was enemy soldiers who entered (the camp)?’

For μολ- ὃς σὺ see Bothe, Euripides’ Werke (supra, n. 190) 366. The mss. reading μολ- ὃς σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις (impossible because of the word-order) probably originated in an effort to do away with the somewhat convoluted relative attraction. The problem cannot be solved by a mere re-shuffling of words, such as μολ- ὃς λέγεις σὺ πολεμίων (Blaydes229): it would be unusual to have the first short of the fifth-‘foot’ tribrach so strongly divorced (σὺ |
πόλε) from the other two\textsuperscript{230}. Morstadt\textsuperscript{231} took τῶν σοῦ μολόντων ὃν σὺ πολέμων λέγεις to mean ‘when those foes of yours came, those you’re talking about’ (cf. 866 οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὗς λέγεις ‘Οδυσσέας). But in such a case συμμάχων in 847 would lack a necessary qualification: the Trojans and their allies need to be distinguished from the Thracian newcomers. Moreover, τῶν σοῦ … σὺ seems redundant.

Diggle’s *cruces around* †συμμάχων† indicate an apparent illogicality: the murdered Thracians were all Trojan allies, and so it the charioteer’s claim that ‘none of your allies’ was harmed seems at first sight nonsensical\textsuperscript{232}. However, the Thracian newcomers are clearly distinguished from the Trojan / allied contingent both spatially (519-20) and because of their longer standing as fighting allies, and it would probably not be inapposite to refer to them as ‘Hector’s allies’ by a mild catachresis. A similar point has been made by L. Battezzato: ‘Lines 138-9 imply that the Trojans and the allies (before the arrival of Rhesus) are all in one location. The position of the allies is explicitly clear if we keep συμμάχων at line 847: the Thracian charioteer knows that the Trojans and their allies are all in the same location. The word συμμάχων here needs to mean “all who fight on your side”, i.e. Trojans and the allies other than the Thracians—who have just arrived, and whose allegiance has been repeatedly questioned.’\textsuperscript{233}

63. Rh. 875-6

\begin{verbatim}
ὅλοθ’ ο δράσας: οὐ γὰρ †εἰς σὲ τείνεται† 875
γλῶσσ’, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς: ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται
ὀλοθ’ ο δράσας: ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται ceteris omissis Chr. Pat. 276, haud
male eic sē fere LQAf: eicētī V sensum requiro ‘numquam cohibebitur’
\end{verbatim}

‘May the doer perish — what I am saying is not meant for you, brag as you may; Justice is aware of it’.

A *locus vexatus*. In principle, οὐ γὰρ εἰς σὲ τείνεται | γλῶσσ’ *could* mean ‘my tongue is not aimed at you’, i.e. ‘you are not the target of my virulent remarks’; for the figurative use of τείνειν (no doubt a metaphor from archery, e.g. E. *Hec.* 263 ἐς τήνδ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐνδίκως τείνω φόνον) cf. especially Pl. *Phd.* 63a καὶ μοι δοκεῖ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον; E. *Hipp.* 797 οὐκ εἰς γέροντας ἥδε σοι τείνει (‘concerns’) τύχη; see further LSJ s.v. τείνω, 1.4 (E. *Ph.* 435 ἐς σὲ τείνει τῶνδε διάλυσις κακῶν is different: see Mastronarde

\textsuperscript{230} Cf. Descroix, *Trimètre* (supra, n. 33) 163.
\textsuperscript{231} Morstadt, *Beitrag* (supra, n. 40) 44.
\textsuperscript{232} See already Morstadt, *Beitrag* (supra, n. 40) 43-4.
\textsuperscript{233} L. Battezzato, “The Thracian camp and the fourth actor at *Rhesus* 565-691”, *CQ* 50, 2000, 367-73 (here 368 n. 9).
For the tongue as a bow shooting words cf. e.g. A. Su. 446 with Friis-Johansen and Whittle ad l. Thus, the tenor of the passage could be, in effect, ‘how can you [i.e. Hector] be so arrogant (cf. ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς) as to think that my remarks are directed at you?’

However, the charioteer has so far been vehement in his denunciation of Hector’s supposedly criminal behaviour; a volte-face here would be both unexpected and inexplicable. To assume, with Mastronarde (l.c., supra, n. 234), that ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται means ‘but Justice knows the truth’, viz. that the charioteer’s curse does properly fall upon Hector, even though the Thracian has just assured Hector that ‘the curse I utter is not directed at you’, is both to strain the Greek and to muddle the passage’s logic — especially if the force of γάρ is ‘(I feel free to utter my curse against the slayer in your very presence,) for on your own hypothesis it doesn’t apply to you’ (thus Mastronarde). Moreover, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς seems to refer to a positive assertion of Hector’s prior to this; still, the only statement of Hector’s that could qualify as κόμπος is his claim, in 856-8, to have never received any complaints about his dealing with his allies, and this would be too far back for the charioteer to refer to it now.

Alternatively, one may attempt to restore, as Diggle suggests (in app. crit.), the sense ‘I will not hold my tongue’. Apart from everything else, this would also make much better sense of ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς, which would now look back to 874: Hector’s alleged ‘presumption’ consists in thinking that he could silence the inconvenient charioteer. But it is hard to think of a paleographically plausible way of obtaining the sense posited by Diggle: for instance, ὄλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας· καὶ γὰρ οὐ καθέξεται | γλῶσσ’ is perhaps easy enough to make up but scarcely follow from the transmitted text.

All in all, it may be best to delete οὐ γὰρ … σὺ κομπεῖς as a Binneninterpolation, as Diggle implies in app. crit.: the words are, after all, omitted in the corresponding passage in Chr. Pat. 276. The omission yields acceptable sense: ὄλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας· ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται, ‘may the doers perish — and Justice is aware of who the doers are’ or ‘Justice is aware that what I am saying is true’.

64. Rh. 882-4

τί ποτ’ εὐτυχίας ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης
Τροίαν ἀνάχει πάλιν ἐς πένθη
δαμων ἄλλος, τί φυτεύων;

‘Whatever is the reason that an adverse deity is carrying Troy from great success to mourning? What is he up to?’

234 Cf. Mastronarde, in Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 29.
In 883, ἀνάγει is B. Heath’s conjecture, which subsequently turned up in Ἀφ (otherwise of little value). It restores the metre as against VL (ἀγει) and Q (ἀγοι), both of which seem to be due to haplography (ΤΡΟΙΑΝΑΝΑΓΕΙ). Although ἀνάγει, ‘brings back’ (cf. παλιν), is apposite (‘a δαίμων is leading Troy back to her old misfortunes’), it does seem rather odd that in a context bemoaning a change from good to bad fortune the author should have chosen a verb that can also mean ‘lift up’, ‘raise’ ‘elevate’, as indeed it does in S. Aj. 131–2 ήμέρα κλίνει τε κάνάγει πάλιν | ἄπαντα τάνθρωπεια. One wonders if the Q reading (ἀγοι) may not point to another, more promising solution, namely <ἄ> ἄγοι, ‘why would an adverse deity be changing Troy’s fortune?’; for the potential optative in questions, expressing ‘what may hereafter prove to be true’ cf. S. El. 1450 ποῦ δῇτ ἤν εἶεν οἱ ξένοι; (Kühner–Gerth [supra, n. 22] 1, 234-5; Goodwin, Syntax [supra, n. 34] § 238).

65. Rh. 886–8

tίς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς θεός, ὦ βασιλεῦ,
tῶν νεόκμητον νεκρὸν ἐν χειροῖν
φοράδην πέμπει;
887 νεόκμητον LQ (νεόχμ- V) : νεόδμητον Va and Chr. Pat. 1456 (αἴρειν δάμων τὸν νεόδμητον χρεών).

‘Who is this god above our heads, O King, that escorts the man who died of late, bearing him in her arms?’

νεόκμητον is a hapax in the sense ‘newly killed’; otherwise, νεόκμητος/νεοκμης are found only in late Greek, and only in the sense ‘newly wrought’ or ‘fresh’. This is evidently a Homerizing usage, harking back to the well-known epic euphemism οἱ καμόντες = ‘the dead’ (LSJ s.v. κάμνω, II. 4), a usage common also in tragedy and prose. The ‘tautology’ νεόκμητον νεκρόν seems also to be Homeric in origin, cf. νεκροὺς κατατεθνήσατας and the like (II. 16.526, 18.540, Od. 10.530); for tragic examples cf. S. Ant. 26 θανόντα . . . νέκυν, 515 ὁ καθανὼν νέκυς; E. Hel. 1252 τοὺς θανόντας . . . νεκροὺς; Su. 45 (cf. 974) φθιμένων νεκύων, 107 νεκρὸν τῶν ὀλωλότων, 524, 558; also Collard on E. Su. 16b-17.

As for the variant νεόδμητον, it can stand only by assuming synecphonesis (νεόδμ-). The word should mean either (i) ‘newly tamed’, from δαμάω (cf.

---


236 For a comparable error from haplography cf. Men. fr. 842 Kassel–Austin σιγυνόμενος ἄγχιστα πενίαν <ἄν> φέροις, on which see R. Porson, Adversaria, Cambridge 1812, 278.
νεόδμητος)\textsuperscript{237}; or (ii) ‘recently constructed’, from root *δεμ-\textsuperscript{238}. Only meaning (i) would be suitable in this context: cf. δαμάξω = ‘kill’, LSJ s.v., III.2; for δμαθέντες = τεθυνότες cf. E. Tro. 175 with Biehl ad l.; IT 199, 230; Alc. 127. Taking into account that νεόδμητος = ‘recently killed’ is unparalleled in pre-Hellenistic literature (lycophr. 65 πρὸς νεόδμητον νέκυν; cf. Nonn. 47.213 νεόδμητοιο Koechly: νεοτμ- mss.), we may safely assume that νεόδμητον in Βα and Chr. Pat. reflects Hellenistic and later usage. Indeed, it appears that in later Greek νεόδμητος and νεόκμητος came to be regarded as essentially synonymous\textsuperscript{239}; this will no doubt have encouraged confusion in the manuscript tradition.

66. \textit{Rh}. 904-5

\begin{quote}
όσον προσήκει μη γένους κοινωνίαν
έχοντι λύπης τὸν σὸν οἰκτίρω γόνον.  \\
904-905 οἰκτίρω γόνον οἰκτίρων.  \\
λύπης Kirchhoff: -η L: -ην VQ
\end{quote}

‘With as much grief as befits a non-relative I feel pity for your offspring.’

The transmitted text makes for awkward syntax: it requires us to take οἰκτίρω = ‘I feel as much pity (with λύπης as partitive genitive from οἰκτίρω) as a non-relative’; but λύπης would be both redundant and too far removed from οἰκτίρω for their syntactic relationship to be adequately apparent. One way out of the difficulty is to read οἰκτίρω γόνον as cognate accusative with λύπης = ‘I feel as much pity,’ and that λύπης was hesitantly suggested by Wecklein\textsuperscript{240}. But again it would be clumsy to separate οἰκτίρω and λύπη so widely; besides, Chr. Pat. 1159 οἰκτίρω γόνον shows that οἰκτίρω is firmly ensconced in the tradition. Another possibility is Kirchhoff’s … μη γένους κοινωνίαν | έχοντι λύπης κτλ.\textsuperscript{241}, ‘as much as it becomes a non-relative it is with grief that I feel pity for your offspring’; but again λύπης would be redundant in view of οἰκτίρω\textsuperscript{242}.

As a simpler remedy I suggest: … μη γένει κοινωνίαν | έχοντα λύπης, ‘as far as it becomes someone who shares your grief though not qua relative’; for this use of γένει see LSJ s.v., I.1; for the accusative (έχοντα) instead of the dative after an impersonal verb (προσήκει) cf. Kühner–Gerth (\textit{supra}, n. 22) 2, 591.

\textsuperscript{238} Cf. Pi. I. 3/4.80.
\textsuperscript{239} Cf. Suid. ν 194 (III.450.14 Adler) and Phot. p. 294.22 Porson νεόκμητον νεωστὶ κατεκευασμένον.
\textsuperscript{240} N. Wecklein (ed.), \textit{Euripidis Rhesus}, Leipzig 1902, in app. crit. ad l.
\textsuperscript{242} Cf. further Nauck, “Studien” (\textit{supra}, n. 20) 185.
67. Rh. 910–14

ἀ θ’ Ἕλλανα λιποῦσα δόμον

Φρυγίον λεχέον ἐπλευσε πλαθείσ’,

†ὑ' Ίλιό ὀλεσε† μὲν σ’ ἐκατι Τροίας,

φιλτατε, μυριάδας τε πόλεις

ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔκένωσεν.

910 Ἕλλανα Badham: ἑλένα Ω

ὤ τ’ ἔπλευσε Jackson, ἀπὸ δ’ ὀλεσε

Henning (ἀπὸ τ’ Wecklein), ὅπον ὀλεσε Wilamowitz σ’ ἐκατι Bruhn: σε

κατὰ Ω 913 μυριάδος uel μυριάδων Ritchie πόλεων Reiske

‘(May the woman perish) too, who abandoned her Greek home and sailed off to lie in a Phrygian bed; and she destroyed you, my dearest, for Troy’s sake(?) and emptied myriads of cities of their good men’.

There seems to be some textual corruption at 911 ἐπλευσε πλαθείσ’. As Kovacs points out243, πλαθείσ’ is extremely awkward in its confused relation both to ἐπλευσε and to λιποῦσα. The awkwardness remains, at least in relation to λιποῦσα (does it precede or follow πλαθείσ’?), even if we assume, with Mastronarde244, that “Phrygian bed” refers to a bed already shared with [the Phrygian] Paris, her new sexual partner, not to a bed in Phrygia she has yet to reach’. Kovacs (l.c., supra, n. 243) proposes a simple emendation, namely πλέουσ’ ἐπλάθη, which addresses both problems in tandem (the hiatus in ἐπλάθη | ὑ’ implies period-end, cf. below). Kovacs also advances a metrical argument in favour of his emendation: according to him, assuming period-end at 911 (since the concluding bacchiac, a catalectic metre, is followed by a breve in the next line) would be incompatible with the elision in πλαθείσ’. However, catalexis (or ‘pattend close’) is not a mark of period-end if followed by double short, as here245. The point is also made by Mastronarde, l.c. (supra, n. 244) 21: ‘The metrical argument used by [Kovacs] applies properly to passages of single-short rhythm and is misapplied in this passage containing double-short movement: the lack of period end in these enoplians is correctly accepted by Wilamowitz, Zanetto, and Dale.’

Another problem concerns †ὑ’ Ίλιό ὀλεσε† at 912. This unmetrical phrase has generally been obelized as corrupt, or emended away. Thus, Jackson suggested <ὁ> διώλεσε (with ὁ standing for λέχεω);246; H. Henning

243 Kovacs, Euripidea Tertia (supra, n. 11) 149–50.

244 In Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 21.

245 See T. C. W. Stinton, Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy, Oxford 1990, 326 n. 41.

246 Marginalia (supra, n. 17) 66.
ἀπὸ δ’ ὤλεσε 247; and Wilamowitz ὁποῦ ὀλεσε 248. Were it certain that ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ ὤλεσε is corrupt, then Wilamowitz’s emendation would be the obvious choice: the subordinate clause it introduces helps preserve the basic structure ὄλοιτο X, ὃς … initiated in 906-8 (with ὄλοιτο Ἐλένα understood as antecedent of the relative clause at 910ff.). Moreover, Wilamowitz’s emendation provides ‘an easy explanation of the paradox: ὁποῦ, referring to a Troy that had to be understood out of Φρυγίων, was difficult enough for someone that he added an explanatory note, which in time effaced ὁποῦ’ 249. However, it seems awkward to have a vague ὁποῦ = ‘Troy’ juxtaposed with an explicit Τροιάς in the same verse. One wonders whether the corruption may not lie rather in σὲ κατὰ Τροιάς, ‘which is faulty both in sense and rhythm’ 250. True, E. Bruhn’s σ’ ἐκατη Τροιάς is satisfactory, but what if κατὰ Τροιάς were a gloss on ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ rather than vice-versa (thus e.g. Paley)? For ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ in tragedy cf. A. Ag. 860, 882, 1439 (cf. also ὑπὸ Τροία in 1457); Ch. 345; E. Andr. 1182; Hec. 764; El. 881; Or. 58, 102. If so, then one might consider reading, as an exempli gratia suggestion, ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιον ὀλεσεν σε βάντα (cf. already Hermann’s ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιο 252): for the triple τε (ἀ’ ἠ … ἐπελευσε … ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιον ὀλεσε … μυρίας τε πόλεις … ἐκένοσεν) see Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 504-5; for ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιον … βάντα cf. Il. 2.216, 673 ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιόν ἠλθε. Noteworthy is also Paley’s ὑπὸ δ’ (malim ὑπὸ τ’) Ἰλιον ὀλεσεν σε πύργος 253.

The emendation suggested, exempli gratia, in the previous paragraph is compatible with the lectio tradita ἐπελευσε πλαθεῖσα in 911, but not with Kovacs’ emendation πλέουσα ἐπελαθη, since a hiatus between 911 and 912 is precluded by the probable lack of period-end at 911 (see above). In other words, the problem of the temporal relation between πλαθεῖσα and λιποῦσα remains. For want of a better solution, it may be advisable, at least for the time being, to accept that the problem is innate, a genuine fault of the author’s style rather than the result of textual corruption. After all, it would not be the first time this author utilizes what is evidently meant to be precious tragic style but is in fact bad or contorted Greek: see my forthcoming commentary on Rhesus, notes to 8, 90-4, 109-11, 143-5a, 226-7, 355-6, 360-7, 414b-15, 424-5, 519-20, 523-5a, 619-21, 624-6, 633, 647-8, 710-14, 986-7.

Lastly, in 913, the adjectival use of μυρίας seems unparalleled: one should have expected either μυρίας πόλεις or μυρίας πόλεων. Despite

247 Teste Wecklein, Euripidis Rhesus (supra, n. 240) 55, who printed it in slightly modified form as ὑπὸ τ’ ὀλεσε.
249 Quotation from Kovacs, Euripidea Tertia (supra, n. 11) 149.
250 Quotation from Porter, Rhesus (supra, n. 111) ad 910ff.
251 RhM 48, 1893, 630.
252 Hermann, Opuscula (supra, n. 60) 310.
253 Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad 912.
various attempts to explain or emend it away, μυριάδας has remained an intractable crux. Thus, Vater and Ritchie wished to construe καὶ πόλεις ἐκένωσε μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, ‘and she emptied cities of myriads of good men’ 254. However, (i) to take μυριάδας with ἀνδρῶν goes against the run of the sentence 255; and (ii) κενόω with double accusative is unparalleled, since in Pi. Pyth. 3.97-8 τὸν μὲν … θύγατρας ἔρημωσαν … | ἐν μυριάσιν ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, it seems best (despite LSJ s.v. ἐρημόω II.1) to take μέρος as accusative of respect rather than as object of ἐρημόωσαν: ‘his three daughters, each one for her part, deprived him of his happiness’. As an alternative, Ritchie l.c. (supra, n. 254) suggested emending into μυριάδων or μυριάδος; but the resulting consecutive genitives (μυριάδων / μυριάδος ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν) would be clumsy. The same goes for Reiske’s μυριάδων τε πόλεων 257: it is an obvious remedy 258, but rather awkward in view of the following genitives; indeed, it is precisely those genitives that, one expects, should have protected πόλεων, had it been the original reading. The best way out of the conundrum, faute de mieux, is Wilamowitz’s suggestion that adjectival μυριάδας is a Boeoticism, apparently paralleled in Corinn. PMG 654 (a) col. i.34 Page ἐν μυριάσι λαοῖς (=ἐν μυριάσι Λαοίς) 259. For another Boeoticism in Rhesus cf. 523 προταινὶ τάξεων: its Boeotian character, affirmed by Parmeniscus (thus the ancient scholiast, Schwartz, Scholia [supra, n. 147] 340), has been confirmed by epigraphy: προτηνὶ occurs at least 3 times in Boeotian inscriptions (IG 7.1739.11, 14 Thespiae; restored by Dittenberger in IG 7.2406.7 Thebes); a fourth instance may be lurking in BCH 21 (1897) 554.2 / 557.2 (Thespiae, suppl. G. Colin) ὑπάρχη δὲ ἐν τῇ προτηνὶ ποτῆρι προτηνὶ ὑπάρχη δὲ ἐν τῇ προτηνὶ ποτῆρι προτηνὶ ὑπάρχη δὲ ἐν τῇ προτηνὶ ποτῆρι προτηνὶ ὑπάρχη δὲ ἐν τῇ προτηνὶ ποτῆρι 

68. Rh. 923-4

… μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελῳδίας κλεινῳ σοφιστῇ Θρηκί… κλεινῳ Dobree: κεῖνῳ(ι) Ω: δεινῳ Valckenaer

‘…a supreme contest of music against the renowned Thracian singer…’

254 Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 899; Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 177; cf. Jouan, Euripide (supra, n. 29) p. 53 n. 270.
255 Cf. Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad 914.
256 Adduced by Ritchie (supra n. 254).
257 Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 92.
258 Cf. also Blaydes, Adversaria (supra, n. 72) 11; for the synizesis see Diggle, Studies (supra, n. 47) 93, 1207
259 Wilamowitz, Verskunst (supra, n. 68) 585 n. 1.
The mss reading is untenable: we should expect either σοφιστῇ κείνῳ or κείνῳ τῷ σοφιστῇ. One possibility is Dobree’s κλεινῷ, but Valckenaer’s δεινῷ may be slightly preferable in view of E. Hipp. 921 δεινὸν σοφιστήν; Su. 903 δεινὸς σοφιστῆς (del. Porson, prob. Diggle); Trag. adesp. fr. 323 Kannicht-Snell (perhaps a parody or an alternative version of E. Su. 903).

69. Rh. 938-40

καὶ τοῦδ’, Ἀθάνα, παντὸς αἰτία μόρου—
οὐδὲν δ’ Ὕδυςαες οὐδ’ ὁ Τυδέως τόκος
ἐδρασε—δρῶσα μὴ δόκει λεληθέναι.

940
938 καὶ: σὺ Kirchhoff 940 ἔδρασε—δρῶσα Lenting: ἔδρασε δράσας Ω (cf. Chr. Pat. 1411 ἔδρας δράσας κτλ.); ἔδρας’—ἔδρασας Heath, quibus acceptis τοῦτ’ pro τοῦδ’ 938 Paley

‘And you, Athena, cause of all this massacre —for neither Odysseus nor Tydeus’ son did anything,— do not think that your act has escaped notice.’

Lenting’s emendation requires a parenthesis in 939-40 and an intransitive use of δρῶσα. Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad 938-40 accepts Heath’s (οὐδὲν δ’ Ὅδ- ... ἔδρασ’) ἔδρασας, μὴ δ- λ- in 940; his further change of τοῦδ’ into τοῦτ’ in 938 aims at furnishing ἔδρασας with an object. 265 But surely the transmitted text can be defended. As Matthiae saw, οὐδὲν ... ἔδρασ), since it was Athena who masterminded it (cf. 945 κατέκτεινας σύ). This is no doubt an attempt to reproduce a well-known Euripidean mannerism, which has been recently discussed by, inter alios, Diggle, Parker (ad E. Alc. 521), and Olson (adAr. Ach. 395-6). For such paradoxes one may further compare h. Merc. 92 καὶ τε ἱδὼν μὴ ἱδὼν εἶναι καὶ κωφὸς ἀκούσας; A. Ag. 1623 οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε;

260 Dobree, Adversaria (supra, n. 12) 88.
261 L. C. Valckenaer, Εὐρυπίδου Ἄπολιτος: Euripidis tragoedia Hippolytus, Lugduni 1822, 262.
262 Nova Acta Literaria Societatis Rheno-Trajectinae 1, 1821, 77.
263 For such parenthetic statements see Diggle, Studies (supra, n. 47) 115-16; Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 428-9 with n. 40.
264 See Heath, Notae (supra, n. 235), Euripidean section p. 98, notwithstanding his inept οὐ δόκει λ-.
265 Cf. his explanation: ‘And this, O Athena, thou sole cause of his fate,—for neither Ul- ysses nor Diomed in fact was guilty,—thou hast done; think not it has escaped my notice.’
266 Matthiae, Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 45) ad 937.
(apparently proverbial, see Fraenkel ad l. and cf. especially [Dem.] 25.89); PV 447-8 βλέποντες ἐβλέπον μᾶτιν, | κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον (with Griffith ad l.); S. Aj. 85 ἐκ δοῦματος βλέφαρα καὶ δεδορκότα; OT 413 οὐ καὶ δεδορκός οὐ (Reiske : δεδορκας καυ mss.) βλέπεις; for a late ex. cf. [Men.] Mon. 586 Pernigotti ὁ γραμμάτων ἄπειρος οὐ βλέπει βλέπον.

The transmitted text would be improved with Kirchhoff’s σῦ for καὶ at 938: ‘You, Athena, (are the) cause of all this massacre; neither Odysseus nor Tydeus’ son did anything, even though they did act. Do not think that your act has escaped notice.’

70. Rh. 948-9

καὶ τῶν ἰμμηθών παῖδ’ ἔχουσ’ ἐν ἄγκαλις
θηρινῷ σοφιστήν δ’ ἄλλον οὐκ ἐπάξομαι.

‘And as my recompense for all these things, I now lament my son whom I hold in my arms; thus, I will never bring another skilled artist (into Athens).’

A much-debated phrase. Sense and context seem to require something along the lines already suggested by Hardion:


269 The quotation is from p. 527. There is no need to discuss Hardion’s absurd idea that this is a covert reference to Socrates.

270 Beck, Exercitatio (supra, n. 81) 14 n. 8.

271 For σοφίς (‘learned’ or ‘skilled’) used of poets and musicians cf. LSJ s.v., I.1. For σοφιστής in connection with musicians see M. Coray, Wissen und Erkennen bei Sophokles, Basel/Berlin 1993, 138.

272 e.g. O. F. Gruppe, Ariadne: die tragische Kunst der Griechen, Berlin 1834, 327: ‘ich werde dir keinen Weisen mehr hersenden’; Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad 942: ‘But I will take care not to bring into Athens any more teachers of religion and art’.

273 Thus e.g. Matthiae, Euripidis tragoeidiae (supra, n. 45) ad 946; Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) cxxvi; cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπάξω, II.1, 2, 4; Schwyzer, Grammatik (supra, n. 50) 231.
no alternative interpretation carries any conviction. Thus, Musgrave\textsuperscript{274}, followed by Matthiae \textit{l.c.} (\textit{supra} n. 273), thought the phrase means ‘\(\theta ρην\\)\(\omega\), and I need no other skilled artist to sing my dirge’ (‘\textit{musicum alium naeniae canendae causa non adducam}’), an interpretation that appears to be corroborated by the similarly phrased \textit{E. Herc.} 911-12 μάντιν οὖχ | ἔτερον ἄξομαι (see further Bond \textit{ad l.}); cf. also \textit{Rh.} 952 οὐδὲν μάντεων ἐέδει φράσαι, with Porter, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 111)} \textit{ad} 949. But as Matthiae himself suspected, it would be an irrelevance for the Muse to call attention upon the fact that she will not hire the services of a professional mourner to perform a dirge for her son; tragic lamentation is never performed by proxy.

Again on the basis of \textit{E. Herc.} 911-12, L. Dindorf\textsuperscript{275} and Vater\textsuperscript{276} argued that the phrase means ‘I have no need for a skilled exegete (\textit{veteratore L. Dindorf}) or a prophet (\textit{vate sive interprete Vater}) to reveal to me who the guilty party is’; but of course neither could adduce any evidence for σοφιστής = μάντις\textsuperscript{277}; the same goes for Burnett’s translation ‘diviner or adept’\textsuperscript{278}.

Defending the traditional interpretation, Fantuzzi\textsuperscript{279} has argued that the Muse’s affirmation is in reality a statement of poetics: she refuses to ‘bring over to her side’ (\(\epsilonπάξομαι\)) poets and singers (cf. σοφιστήν), who would be unwilling to perform what Greek poetry, especially tragedy, often brands as anomalous or unbecoming, namely a song on a funereal occasion, cf. e.g. \textit{E. Pho.} 1498-501, \textit{Hel.} 164-6, \textit{IT} 179-85; see further Fantuzzi, \textit{art. cit. (supra, n. 279)} 178-85. However, Fantuzzi’s reading is simply not borne out by the text: one would expect the Muse at least to hint at the supposedly anomalous nature of her song, the more so since her lament is legitimized (as Fantuzzi is aware) already in epic tradition\textsuperscript{280}. Moreover, this interpretation seems to have no use for ἄλλον in σοφιστὴν … ἄλλον: if Fantuzzi were right, there would be no point in the statement that the Muse will bring in no ‘other’ artisans or (with a well-known idiomatic use of ἄλλος) ‘other people, artisans’.

In an alternative suggestion by Leaf, the phrase is taken to imply: ‘I am content with Musaios as my advocate, and need call in no other skilled

\textsuperscript{274} Musgrave, \textit{Εὐριπίδου τά σωζόμενα (supra, n. 181)} 412.
\textsuperscript{275} \textit{teste} Dindorf, \textit{Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 15)} \textit{ad} 949.
\textsuperscript{276} Vater, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 45)} cxxvii.
\textsuperscript{277} Despite Porter, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 111)} \textit{ad} 949, Melampous himself is not called σοφιστής in Hdt. 2.49.1.
\textsuperscript{280} In the \textit{Aethiopis} Thetis was joined in her lament for Achilles by the \textit{Muses} as well as by her own sisters the Nereids; \textit{Procl. Chrest.} 198-9 Severyns = \textit{PEG} I 69.20-1 Bernabé = \textit{EGF} 47.26-7 Davies: καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα. The detail is also mentioned in \textit{Od.} 24.60-2 and in \textit{Pi.} I. 8.57-60.
plerader to speak on my behalf. This is an improvement upon an untenable suggestion first put forward by Reiske, namely ‘doctorem & testem huius rei locupletem habeo filium meum, ut opus alio non habeam’ (but a σοφιστής is not a testis, and at any rate Rhesus’ dead body could scarcely serve as proof of the murderer’s identity). Promising as Leaf’s suggestion may seem, it is unlikely: the intervening καὶ τῶν θεῶν... θρηνῶ permanently shifts the focus from the Muses’ importance for Athenian culture to this particular Muse’s personal grief.

Finally, Richards suggested that the Muse, considering that her association with the musician Thamyris led to the ill-fated birth of Rhesus, and that the Muses’ generosity in offering the musicians Orpheus and Musaeus to Athens was basely rewarded by the death of Rhesus, resolves ‘never to bring down on [her] head another musician’. This is impossibly contorted.

All things considered, it appears that Hardion’s and Beck’s intuition, described in this note’s first paragraph, was right, and that σοφιστήν ἄλλον δ’ οὐκ ἐπάξομαι is best taken as the Muse’s vengeful response to Athena’s ungrateful, perverted ‘recompense’ (948 μισθόν): as an act of retaliation, the Muse will retract the benefits she once bestowed on Athens. True, the middle ἐπάξομαι remains problematic, and it will not do to imagine, with Burnett, that it merely stresses the Muse’s personal interest in Athens’ cultural excellence: the Muse cannot be speaking from an Athenian perspective — not in this context of express enmity against Athens. One solution might be to emend into ἐπάξομεν (Paley): the shift into the first-person ‘heroic plural’, however jarring, is adequately paralleled in Euripides (see Bond on Herc. 858). Still, the pluralis maiestatis is never used elsewhere by the Muse, presumably because she reserves the plural for references to herself and her sisters as a group (e.g. Rh. 891, 921-5, 941-2, 947, 976). Given the frequent lack, in Greek, of any appreciable difference between active and middle verbal forms, interchangeability or downright confusion were common, and not only among non-native speakers (as in Ar. Thesm. 1005, Pax 291). More importantly, the Rhesus author does use problematic middle forms elsewhere, or use active forms where one would have preferred active forms. This is problematic, and it was clearly not the intended meaning. One would...

282 Reiske, Animadversiones (infra, n. 32) 93.
284 Cf. Jouan, Euripide (infra, n. 29) p. 78 n. 280(3).
285 Cf. in the last instance Fantuzzi, “La mousa” (infra, n. 279) 189-90 n. 50.
286 Burnett, “Rhesus” (infra, n. 278) 187 n. 109.
287 Paley, Euripides (infra, n. 136) ad 948.
288 See further Schwyzer, Grammatik (infra, n. 50) 232-3, 234-5.
289 In 805, middle δυσοίζου is unique, and the sense problematic. Active δυσοίζω probably means ‘to cry out in distress’ or ‘in indignation’, but ‘you should stop wailing because Rhesus was after all killed by enemies’ cannot possibly be the intended meaning here. One would
expect the middle\(^{290}\), and so it would not be unreasonable to infer a similar error in the present passage.

A final hurdle is οὐκ ἐπάξομαι where one might expect οὐκέτ' ἐπάξομαι; but there seem to be sufficient parallels for this omission of -έτι: Rh. 451 μὴ τις ἀσπίδ' ἀφηται (=μηκέτι τις); also, e.g., S. Ant. 91 ὅταν δὴ μὴ σθένω, πεπαύσομαι (=ὅταν δὴ μηκέτι σθ').

The Muse’s climactic threat, to the effect that she will henceforth withdraw her favour from Athens, has also been remarked upon by P. Wilson\(^{291}\), who has pointed out that ‘one could read it, perhaps a little facetiously, as a kind of aition for the end of Athens’ poetic productivity [...] A Muse herself announces the end of Athens’ musical privilege and poetic supremacy, and the departure of those deities from an ungrateful city.’ In a similar vein, I have argued (with no awareness of Wilson’s remarks) that the Muse’s severe criticism of Athens is hard to reconcile with the assumption of Athenian authorship, whereas it is compatible with the hypothesis that Rhesus was written for a Macedonian audience\(^{292}\).

71. Rh. 961

φίλος γὰρ ἐλθὼν δυστυχῶς ἀπέρχεται

‘For though he came in friendship he is departing in misfortune’.

At first sight, Vater’s ἀποίχεται seems attractive\(^{293}\); the perfective mode seems in order because Rhesus is already ‘gone’; moreover, ἀποίχομαι seems to be a key term in Greek funerary discourse\(^{294}\). Equally plausible is Nauck’s διοίχεται\(^{295}\). cf. S. Aj. 972-3 ἐμοὶ | λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται. But either emendation would destroy the studied antithesis with ἐλθών: Rhesus is now leaving (ἀπέρχεται) Troy in very different circumstances from those surrounding his arrival (ἐλθὼν).

\(^{290}\) In 982, διοίχει (sc. βίον) is unusual, since it is the middle, not the active, that is used absolutely (LSJ s.v. διαφέρω, 1.2; cf. S. Aj. 511); cf. 600 εἰ διοίχει νῦκτα τῆνδ’.


\(^{292}\) Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 946.

\(^{293}\) Cf. P. A. Hansen (ed.), Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculi IV a.Chr.n., Berlin 1989, no. 75.2; W. Peek, Griechische Vers-Inscriptions, Berlin 1955, nos. 210.1, 238.2, 647.6, 785.2, 844.7, 1121.6, 1237.6, 1438.7, 1474.4, 1892.4, 2089.2; Ar. Ra. 83 (a parody of funeral language); fr. 504.10 Kassel–Austin ὁ μακαριστός οἴχεται.

\(^{295}\) Nauck, “Studien” (supra, n. 20) 186.
72. Rh. 974-5

ῥᾷον δὲ πένθος τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ
οἴσω θανεῖν γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐκ κείνης χρεῶν.

I will bear my grief more easily than the sea goddess will; for her own son must die too.

The credit for ῥᾷον belongs really to Valckenaer, who proposed the emendation in a set of manuscript notes, which are dated 24 Febr. 1749, but were published only recently by P. J. Finglass. Musgrave, who actually got around to publishing the same emendation, hit upon it independently several years later than Valckenaer — a coincidence pointed out by Valckenaer himself: ‘mihi dudum id ipsum in mentem venisse’.

This neat emendation should have won universal approval; cf. especially E. Hipp. 205-6 ῥᾴον δὲ νόσον ... οἴσεις; Α. PV 104 αἴσαν φέρειν ὡς ῥάστα. However, βαιόν is still printed by Zanetto and defended by Feickert as meaning ‘presently, after a short while’. But βαιός never has this meaning, and supposed parallels turn out to be illusory: in S. OC 1653 ἔπειτα μέντοι βαιόν οὐδὲ σὺν χρόνῳ, construe βαιόν ἔπειτα, ‘shortly afterwards’ (cf. S. Phil. 20 βαιόν ἐν εὐερθέν); and in S. Trach. 335 βαιόν ἄμμεινοι means ‘waiting for a short while’, not ‘after a short while’. Even if βαιόν could mean ‘presently’, the resulting sense would still be absurd in the present context; for though a participant in the lamentations for Achilles (976-7), the Muse cannot properly be said to ‘bear’ a grief that really belongs to Thetis (cf. 977 Θέτιδος ἐν πένθει). Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad l. explains: ‘though they will one day have to take part in the mourning of Thetis for her son [...], they will feel it but lightly [i.e. βαιόν] ... in comparison with the loss of Rhesus’. This is entirely off the mark, not least because ‘in comparison with the loss of Rhesus’ is not in the Greek.

The L reading θαλασσίου θεοῦ is unlikely both because of the phrasing in this passage’s model, namely E. fr. 885 Kannicht ἄληθες, ὡ παὶ τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ; and because, as pointed out by E. Harrison, it is hard to parallel θεός preceded by feminine article with an intervening adjective in -ος. Harrison, apparently unaware of this passage’s Euripidean model, considers reading θαλασσίου θεᾶς, which would incidentally also eliminate interlinear hiatus. True, θαλασσίους is feminine in E. IT 236, but all the instances of feminine
article + adjective in -ος + feminine noun cited by Harrison (S. OC 39-40, 458; E. Andr. 978, Su. 260, IT 944, 1113-4) feature compound adjectives, which have no morphologically distinct feminine endings anyway, and thus cannot support his emendation.